UNITAS

Ecclesia "Clamat ad omnes ut revertantur et inserantur."
—St. Augustine.

INTERNATIONAL QUARTERLY REVIEW

Organ of the Association *Unitas*

ENGLISH LANGUAGE EDITION

Joseph Gill, S.J.: The English Pre-Reformation Church.

Hugh Montgomery: The Church and Judaism.

Mar Severios: The Reunion Movement in Malankara, South India.

George A. Morgan, S.J.: St. Theodore, The Studite, and the Roman Papacy.

Dr. Lino Mangini: Nicholas Cabasilas

COMMENTS AND DOCUMENTS: Alivisatos on the *Instruction;* A Protestant Voice; Bishop O'Hara's Letter to the Rumanian Government.

NEWS: Ecumenism and Reunion; Around the World.

BOOK REVIEW

THE GRAYMOOR PRESS, PEEKSKILL, N. Y.

VOL. II JULY-SEPTEMBER, 1950 NO. 3

Imprimatur:

✠*Aloysius Traglia*
Archiepūs Caesarien. Vicegerens.

Ex Vicariatu Urbis, die 9 iv '49.

The English Pre-Reformation Church

A NOTE.

The Archbishop of Canterbury, shortly before the war, requested the separated Church of Greece to make its mind known with regard to recognition of Anglican Orders. The question was referred by the Holy Synod of the Church of Greece to the theological faculty of the University of Athens, at whose conferences on the subject several professors read papers, parts of which were later published. Some little time after, Dr. Alivisatos, professor of Canon Law, published his contribution to the discussion in full,[1] but by that time the war had cut off easy communication with other countries and so it is only in these last months that his unabridged treatise has come to hand.

Approximately the first half of it is devoted to an outline of the history of the Church of England and of its present position, because "without an established and positive historical background it is impossible to understand the later development, and consequently there can be no fitting guidance to an accurate judgement of certain elements on whose right understanding the requisite investigation and final correct solution of the question utterly depends" (p. 13). That, and the generally prevailing ignorance of the story of the Church in England, were the reasons which caused him to embark on this excursus into English history.

The sources he relied upon for his information were H.S. Wakeman's *An Introduction to the History of the Church of England* (8th edition, revised by S.L. Ollard (1914) and the second chapter of H.C. Headlam's *The Church of England: How it came to be; What it is,* and one may presume that he chiefly used the former of these: at any rate it is exclusively to this that he specifically appeals in the course of his essay. Now it is a fact that it was the fashion some time ago with certain apologists of the Anglican Church to support their contentions on behalf of their Church by making it out to be the natural continuation of the Anglo-Saxon and mediaeval English Church. The Reformation, they said, made no radical change: it only restored or accentuated characteristics already existing in the previous centuries: the Church in England always was, as it is now, an independent, national Church. It would seem, to judge from the quotations made from it, that Wakeman's history, written in the last decade of the last century, is of this type. And so Professor Alivisatos has been sadly misled and in his turn has misinformed his readers. For the truth is that the English Church, the *ecclesia anglicana* as it was called both by Popes and English bishops and kings, was part of the universal Catholic Church until the Reformation, when the arbitrary action of Henry VIII broke its ties with Rome and made it a national Church.

In a note of this kind one cannot enter into detailed criticism of in-

(1) A. S. Alivisatos D.D.: *The validity of Anglican Orders* (in Greek) Athens 1940.

dividual statements. One can only comment on conclusions and try to correct misinterpretations of facts. Professor Alivisatos informs us that by the time of the death of Archbishop Theodore of Canterbury (690), i.e. within 100 years of the entry of St. Augustine into England, "It is further of the greatest significance that the Christian religion, from its first spread in England, took on a national character, and that the Church from its first beginnings until to-day has been most closely bound up with the nation and became a national Church and ended in the completely physical bond which exists between Church and State up to to-day". By that one should judge its present position. The monasteries and schools, set up mainly by the monks, helped the Church to enter closely into the life of the people. "So the people had and has an immediate and not passive interest (as among so many Latin peoples) in the Church and its fortunes, because it was its own business that was in question". "Rome, in spite of its endeavours, never succeeded in rendering the Church of England its subject in the sense in which it succeeded in this in the case of the other Churches of continental Europe" (pp. 20/1).

Yet at this very period, i.e. during the lifetime of Theodore (who, like Augustine, Paulinus and so many others, had been sent to England by Rome), there was frequent communication with Rome. For example Benedict Biscop journeyed to and from Rome at least five times bringing with him treasures of relics and particularly of books. By his agency John, the 'Archicantor' of St. Peter's, Rome, who also was empowered by the Pope to enquire into the orthodoxy of the English Church, set up a monastery and introduced the *Ordo Romanus* of Gregory the Great, which was subsequently taken up all over England, then via English missionaries by Germany and France, so much so that it can be reasonably argued that it came to prevail in the Church through English influences.[2] In the eighth century (735) Rome acceded to the request of King Egbert to raise York to the rank of an archbishopric by the grant of the pallium and Pope Adrian I did as much for the See of Lichfield to please Offa, king of Mercia, though fifteen years later Pope Leo revoked the dignity. The giving of the pallium to an archbishop implied direct dependence on the Holy See and it became the custom for the archbishops to go to Rome in person to receive it. In the ninth century was instituted the offering of Peter's Pence for the use of the Pope and the upkeep of the *Schola Anglorum in Rome,* in the beginning perhaps a personal gift of the king of Wessex, later a tax on 'hearths', and this continued up to the time of the Reformation. England was famous all during this period for the number of its pilgrims who journeyed to Rome. Kings abdicated so as to pass their last days in Rome. Alfred the Great (844-99) went there as boy. Canute the Dane made a

(2) Cf. C. Silva-Tarouca S.J.: *Giovanni 'Archicantor' de S. Pietro a Roma a l'Ordo Romanus da lui composto* in *Atti della Pont. Accad. Rom. di Archeologia, Memorie* Vol. I Pt. I (1923) p. 159.

pilgrimage there in 1026/7. Nothing of all this—and dozens of other indications could be added—suggests a national Church, independent of Rome.

The second period of English Church history, from the Conquest (1066) to the Reformation (1534), is reviewed in the light of Henry VIII's action, as follows: "This is the start of the Reformation of the Church in England and rightly Wakeman poses the question, whether and to what extent Henry founded a new Church in England. Wakeman quite rightly answers his query in the negative, in so far as the abolition of privileges and rights of the Pope . . ., which were acquired on the basis of false titles and privileges and were acknowledged in the West from ignorance and which could never be upheld by the Scriptures and Holy Tradition, does not constitute a contravention of principles of the Christian religion and the Catholic Church which after the abolition of the wrongly-imposed privileges of the Pope remained untouched in England". Only in the above sense is the English Church Protestant. "Through its protest in such a sense the Church of England is linked up with the ancient mediaeval and the Orthodox Churches which, as later also the Anglican Church, never recognized the primacy of the Bishop of Rome, particularly as this was developed during the ages both before and after the Reformation" (pp. 30/1).

Fortunately in latter years there have been several studies written by eminent English historians on the relations between the English Church of this period and Rome. A few quotations from their writings will suffice to sketch a truer picture of the situation and it will be noticed that they assert without hesitation the direct contradictory of what is implied in the above conclusion.

F. M. Maitland, in his day Downing Professor of the Laws of England in the University of Cambridge and, perhaps, still the greatest authority on English legal history, in a series of essays published later in book-form[3] argues that the Church in England accepted the Canon Law of the Church of Rome in its entirety and conducted its affairs by it exclusively, and, further, that it acknowledged the Pope as the 'universal ordinary' of the whole Church. It is not easy to find apt, but short, quotations from these intricate studies, but perhaps the two following will suffice. "But whereas the English State was an independent whole, the English Church was in the eyes of its own judges a dependent fragment whose laws had been imposed on it from without" (p. 44). "Here, then we may see a collision between the claims of the Church and the claims of the State; but there was

(3) F. M. Maitland: *Roman Canon Law in the Church of England;* London (1898). In the preface to the book the author states that it might be taken that he is "an advocate of one of two Churches, the English or the Roman. Therefore, it may be expedient for me to say that I am a dissenter from both, and from other Churches". It may also be expedient to add here that of the writers to be cited in the rest of this article, no single one is a Catholic.

no collision between the law of the Church of England and the law of the Church of Rome. Quite the contrary. The principle for which the English bishops struggled was part and parcel of the canon law of Rome" (p. 54).

Z. N. Brooke, also of Cambridge University, has written on the same subject but to cover a shorter period (1066-1215) and in greater detail.[4] He admits that he began "with a vague idea which I have had to discard. I had already come to the conclusion that the English Church fell into line with the rest of the Church in the latter part of the twelfth century, but it did appear before that to be tending towards independence and taking a distinct course of its own. . . . I have tried to discover the facts behind the mists, and what I have discovered has changed my point of view completely. As I now see it, the English Church was in mind at one with the Church as a whole throughout the period" (p. 226). A few other citations will demonstrate his views. "Moreover it is commonplace to say that the English Church in the Middle Ages was composed of two provinces each with a separate convocation, and that the whole Church did not meet together to act officially as a body except when summoned by a papal legate. It was, in fact, the Papacy that gave the English Church a sense of ecclesiastical unity. And this liberty which the English Church was granted by John in Magna Carta was liberty from royal interference, not liberty from papal control; rather, as with Becket, it implied liberty to be under papal control" (p. 17). "I am of course only considering the question as far as Magna Carta. As national feeling grew, as hostility to the abuses of papal government increased, a different tinge of meaning may perhaps be read into the use of *ecclesia anglicana,* just as, at the end of the Middle Ages, *ecclesia gallicana* conveyed a new implication. Even so, it is only the Reformation that really altered the whole meaning of the phrase; by the Tudors it was deliberately given the particular significance that it now bears" (p. 20). "In the eleventh century there was nobody in England, or elsewhere, who questioned the essential unity of the Church, or denied that it was under papal headship" (p. 23). William the Conqueror "was not in this trying to create a national and independent Church. On the contrary, he had brought the English Church out of its backwater into the regular current once more. He made it an integral part of the Church, to be governed by the laws of the Church . . ." (p. 136). "The English Church was subject to the same laws, to all the same laws, that the rest of the Church obeyed" (p. 99). "So the evidence from Councils, English and papal, is completely in agreement with the evidence provided by the manuscript collections of ecclesiastical law. It equally helps to prove that the law of the Church, the whole law and not a selected part of it, was the law of the English Church" (p. 105). "There is no shred of evidence to show

(4) Z. N. Brooke: *The English Church and the Papacy;* Cambridge (1931).

that the English Church in the eleventh and twelfth centuries was governed by laws selected by itself" (p. 113). "The English Church was not, and did not wish to be, independent. If it was to be as the rest of the Church, it must obey the law of the Church; and, since that law, in England as elsewhere, emphasised throughout the primacy of the Church of Rome, the sovereign authority of the Pope in all things and over all persons ecclesiastical, it must logically accept that sovereignty and be obedient to its dictates. This was recognized, at any rate, by the leading personalities. Theobald . . . had no doubts about it. Henry of Blois . . . accepted it without question. And (king) Stephen himself can have had no illusions about it. . . . The Pope, of course, took it for granted, and acted accordingly" (p. 177).

Another eminent mediaevalist, F. M. Rowicke, this time of Oxford University where he was Regius Professor of Modern History, develops the same theme.[5] He asks: "What did men mean in the Middle Ages when they spoke of the English Church, the Ecclesia Anglicana? The phrase was in frequent use and has an insular implication. It certainly did not mean that there was an independent English Church, for it was used as often by the popes as by others, and indeed was probably given currency in this form by the papal chancery. The whole history of the ecclesiastical system in medieval England forbids us to think that when King John said the English Church was to be free, he, the Pope's vassal, meant to declare its freedom from Rome, He meant that the church was to be free from capricious interference by the secular power. Serious scholars have long refused to join the controversialists who in Maitland's witty words, imagine that the church was Anglican before, and has been Catholic since the Reformation. Nor, in spite of the high position of the Archbishop of Canterbury, who was generally vested with legatine powers, did the Pope or anybody else mean that the church in England was a self-directing province within the universal church, still less that it had any metropolitical claims, as some scholars in the seventeenth century liked to think" (pp. 123/4). Later he adds: "As an interpretation of history, the Protestant view of the medieval Church in England was a travesty. It was hopelessly insular and it would be a waste of time to refute it. . . . The *ecclesia Anglicana* was a group of dioceses, as integral a part of the Western Church, as closely related to Rome as any other group of dioceses. It was governed by the same law, subject to the same spiritual, intellectual and artistic influences. Its local peculiarities of custom and ritual were no greater than the local peculiarities which developed in other parts of Europe" (p. 126). "The operation of canon law and of papal authority" he says "was in some ways more complete in England than in many other countries of Europe" (pp.

(5) F. M. Powicke: *Medieval England, 1066-1485;* London (1931).

136 and 140); but the fact that English kings managed always to prevent papal interference in the disposal of landed property was, in his view, a factor that in the end facilitated the break caused by the Reformation. But the Reformation was a break, not just a minor adjustment: "The greatest revolution in English history reveals most clearly the stubborn continuity of English history. It was hardly over before lawyers and theologians, in their different ways, began to assert that there had been no real revolution at all" (p. 135).

The view of the Reformation, however, put forward in Professor Alivisatos's outline is that the Reformation was no break. For him Henry VIII was practically the ideal of a Christian monarch, who, even savagely, insisted on the observance of church discipline and who culled from the continental Reformation what was good in it for the benefit of the Church in England. He had sought his divorce from his first wife "seeing that Catherine was the widowed wife of his brother" (p. 29)—Professor Alivisatos does not mention that Catherine always strenuously asserted that her first marriage had never been consummated—and what was the occasion for the breach with Rome. "In 1548, a special commission composed the liturgical books and defined the principles of the famous 'Book of Common Prayer', which, as is well known, remains even till now the official book of the Anglican Church. This first form of the book presents relatively small changes from the Latin liturgical books till then in use, from which most of its elements were taken in translation. . . . The care with which under the personal attention of Henry himself the new Book of Common Prayer was put together" was the reason for its general, ready acceptance. After the accession of Edward VI, "immediately some modifications were made in the Book of Common Prayer, but trifling, yet under the influence of reformation-theories, which, however, were speedily eradicated" (p. 33).

Touching though the picture is of Henry's anxious vigilance over the composition of the first Prayer Book, it is unfortunately not true, because Henry was already dead and Edward VI, at the age of nine, had already been proclaimed king in 31st January 1547. His kingdom was ruled for him by a group of men who favoured the new religion because a return of the old might have robbed them of the wealth they had accumulated from the spoil of the monasteries. His Church was ruled for him by Thomas Cranmer, Archbishop of Canterbury, who in 1532, in spite of his clerical celibacy and the laws both of his State and of his Church, had married the niece of Osiander, the Lutheran reformer, and one of whose first acts under Edward was to legalize marriage of the clergy. It was Cranmer who was mainly responsible for the new Book of Common Prayer; and it is Cranmer's doctrinal ideas that predominate in it. He had long

ago given up any belief in a real, objective presence of Christ in the Blessed Sacrament and had repudiated any notion of an objective sacrifice in the Mass. On his eucharistic views Anglican opinion is divided as to whether he was Lutheran, Bucerian or, most probably, Zwinglian.[6] But not even Anglicans claim that he was Catholic. In his composition of the Prayer Book he used ancient Catholic, "Orthodox" and Reformed sources. But he most carefully excised from the prayers he borrowed any word or phrase that taught or suggested the idea that in 'The Supper of the Lord and Holy Communion commonly called the Mass' there was any sacrifice or action by Christ. In that he acted in conformity with his own convictions that that ceremony was nothing more than a bare memorial of the Supper. The Second Prayer Book (1552) did differ from the First, and not only in 'trifling' changes 'which were soon eradicated'. Under the influence of, and largely according to the suggestions of, Bucer[7] 'The Order for the Administration of the Lord's Supper or Holy Communion' (no longer, apparently, 'commonly called the Mass', seeing that this phrase is omitted from the new title) was very much changed, not only verbally to get rid of any traces left of 'the old superstitions', but even by a re-shuffling of its various parts. (The Anglican) Dom Gregory Dix passes the following judgement on Cranmer's Prayer Book: "It is *not* a disordered attempt at a catholic rite, but the only effective attempt ever made to give liturgical expression to the doctrine of 'justification by faith alone' ".[8]

To round off his exposition of English Church history and to show that the Anglican Church of to-day continues in the same tradition and faith of the Church of the earlier centuries, Professor Alivisatos adds a section on the present position of the Anglican Church. He notes briefly the various theological schools and tendencies within that Church and interprets Dr. Headlam's phrase—that 75% of the Church are just 'good Anglicans'—to mean that they are High Church, whereas Dr. Headlam meant that 25% are extremists—Anglo-Catholic or High: Low or Modernist—while the great mass of the faithful, the 75%, is central, not particularly concerned to define too carefully its theological position. He follows what has become the fashion in Anglicanism since the Oxford Movement of depreciating the Articles, even though for three centuries before that they were considered the most important Anglican doctrinal formulary and even now are accepted on oath by all Anglican ministers. As examples of Anglican views he describes at length Dr. Gore's position as that of a more conservative theologian and Dr. Headlam's as of a more liberal one.

---

(6) Cf., e.g., G. Dix: *The Shape of the Liturgy;* London (1945) p. 640 seq.; and, as a consequence of that, G. A. Timms: *Dixit Cranmer;* (1947) and G. Dix: *Dixit Cranmer et non timuit;* London (1948). Also. C. Richardson: *Zwingli and Cranmer on the Eucharist;* Illinois (1949).

(7) The German reformer who at Cranmer's invitation came to England and was appointed Regius Professor of Divinity at Cambridge, in which post he died in 1551.

(8) G. Dix: *The Shape of the Liturgy;* London (1945) p. 672. The italics are in the original.

But he does not mention that Gore popularized the kenotic theory of the Incarnation in Anglican theology;[9] or that Headlam considered that no single Christian body of to-day constitutes the one Church of Christ but that all existing Christian Churches are in schism.[10]

But if Dr. Alivisatos wanted to give an authoritative exposition of Anglican doctrine—or as near as is possible authoritative, because an authoritative decision binding on all Anglicans the Anglican Church by its acknowledged principles cannot give—he would have done better to synopsise a few sections of the Report on *Doctrine in the Church of England,*[11] rather than outline the views of two arbitrarily-chosen Anglican theologians. He does, however, mention this Report—in a footnote (p. 55). There he says that emphasis on Anglican comprehensiveness and on this Report "has no value nor does it provide a basis for any discussions at all, in so far as both have no relation to the official teaching of the Anglican Church and in consequence it is a complete waste of time to bother with them". But, surely, the Anglicans themselves, and generally, pride themselves on their comprehensiveness, seeing that "The comprehensiveness of the Church of England is one of its most distinctive characteristics".[12] It is true that some Anglo-Catholics deplore this 'most distinctive characteristic' of their Church because it gives as much right to the presence on the bench of bishops of a Dr. Barnes as of a Dr. Wand; but, on the other hand, without it they themselves would not be in the Anglican Church for the High Church revival would have been stifled in its very beginnings a hundred years ago. And as regards the 'official teaching' of the Anglican Church, one may legitimately ask Where is it? and What is it? Now that the Articles are generally in disfavour because for some they are too definitely Protestant and for others just too definite, we are told to find it in the Prayer Book. But the Prayer Book can be interpreted as each one desires. Some find in it the Mass and full Catholic doctrine about the Eucharist: others nothing more than Cranmer's memorial of the Supper. And the Anglican Church does not officially say which view is right. Of 'official teaching', it must be admitted, there has been none, at any rate since the time of Queen Elizabeth. But it ought equally to be admitted that the nearest possible approach to it is an official report on doctrinal matters, such, for example, as the Report on *Doctrine in the Church of England.* Yet, in the last resort, it does not really much matter whether it is 'official

(9) In this connection J. S. Lawton: *Conflict in Christology;* London (1947) p. 148 remarks about Gore: "Chalcedonian theology, in its plain meaning, he simply cannot accept."

(10) E.g. *The Doctrine of the Church and Reunion;* London (1920) pp. 224-5: *Christian Unity;* London (1930) p. 85 seq. In this he is supported by the official Report on *Doctrine in the Church of England;* London (1938) p. 112.

(11) *Doctrine in the Church of England: The Report of the Commission on Christian Doctrine appointed by the Archbishops of Canterbury and York in 1922;* London (1938).

(12) The Archbishop of York, C. Garbett: *The claims of the Church of England;* London (1947) p. 28.

teaching' or not. What does matter is whether it is a fair picture of Anglican beliefs and in this point there can be no reasonable doubt.

For that Report was the fruit of sixteen years' labour of a commission of twenty-five representative Anglican theologians whose task was: "To consider the nature and grounds of Christian doctrine with a view to demonstrating the extent of existing agreement within the Church of England and with a view to investigating how far it is possible to remove or diminish existing differences" (Report p. 19). The purpose, therefore, was not to emphasise the division in the Church but rather the unity. But the differences were there. So "we have tried by conference to reach real agreement; where this has proved impossible, we have set out the divergent views that are still found to be held among us" (p. 2). As a result the commission had to acknowledge irreconcilable differences of opinion within the Anglican body on the following points among others:

1. Whether Our Lord had a human father as well as a human mother, i.e. whether He was conceived and born of a virgin. (p. 82).
2. Whether Christ really and physically rose from the dead (pp. 83/8).
3. Whether He worked miracles (pp. 50/2).
4. Whether episcopal ordination is necessary for valid Orders (120-2).
5. Whether Christ is in any real sense present in the Eucharist (pp. 167-171).
6. Whether the Fall, recounted in Genesis, is an historical truth or a myth (pp. 52/3, 68/9).

Nevertheless Professor Alivisatos assures his readers: "I myself, personally, . . . being increasingly of the view that substantial differences between the Anglican Church (and the Orthodox) do not exist" would welcome the realization of the ideal of union (p. 129). He attributes the powerful position of the contemporary Anglican Church in part to "its outstanding spiritual life owed to the later tendencies of Methodism, of the Oxford Movement and, be it said, even of Modernism" (p. 45). But I doubt whether he would welcome into his own Church union or 'an outstanding spiritual life' bought by opening the door to such a bewildering variety of doctrinal opinion.

Professor Alivisatos introduced his historical sketch by urging that the history and development of the Anglican Church should be carefully taken into account when arriving at a decision about its Orders. On this statement, at least both he and I are fully agreed.

J. Gill, S.J.

"I should not be true to my faith," Cardinal Manning once said to a Jew, "if I did not venerate yours," and we must never, as Christians, forget how great a debt we owe to Judaism. The Hebrews created no mighty Empire like the Romans, they were not artists or philosophers like the Greeks; but on the moral and religious plane they undoubtedly surpassed all the other ancient peoples. For, as Yves de Montcheuil has pointed out, their religion did not consist in external rites but in a real relationship with the One True God: and they condemned injustice and preached mercy—not merely on humanitarian grounds but because Yahweh, the world's Sole Creator, is Himself just and holy, and sin could not be tolerated in His chosen people. All this represents something unparalleled in antiquity—something which, so far as it goes, can never be bettered, indeed the spirit of the true Israel lives on in the Catholic Church, the minds of the great architects of Christian civilization, St. Jerome, St. Augustine, St. Thomas and the rest having been nourished on the Jewish Bible.

What exactly do we mean when we talk of the Jews? The expression is hard to define for, as a community, they are unique; no other group has retained its unity and identity under such conditions and in the face of such obstacles. It is not correct, strictly speaking, to call them a race for—since the time of their dispersal—their blood has been mingled with that of the Egyptians, Phoenicians, Arabs, Greeks, Armenians and, later, with that of the modern European nations. When, in the early days of the Nazi movement, a disgruntled young Junker, named Helldorf, aided by a group of "toughs" perpetrated what was known as the Kurfürstendamm raid, a large number of the exotic-looking individuals who were set upon, as they strolled peacefully down the fashionable Berlin boulevard, turned out to be natives of Mediterranean countries with which the Reich desired to be on friendly terms; and an awkward situation arose.

Indeed our *simpliste* Nordic notion of the Jew as a person with a hooked nose is due merely to the fact that, in the chilly lands which we inhabit, persons without snub noses are a rare phenomenon and a large proportion of those possessed of aquiline features are in fact Jews. It would not seem that, in countries like Italy or Spain—still less in the Near East—anyone would attempt to identify a Jew by the cast of his features.

If the Jews are not a race, no more can they be described as a nation. It is true, of course, that there now *is* a nation which is Jewish—the new State of Israel—but this does not at present contain much more than a million Jews; and, whatever the future may hold in store, it does not look as though it would ever comprise more than a small fraction of the whole community. Many Jews indignantly repudiate the applicability of the term "nation" to the Israelite community taken as a whole. They claim that the Jewish citizens of any given country are as patriotic as anybody else, e.g. as Catholics who also own spiritual allegiance to an outside authority. The

widespread view, shared by so eminent an historian as Hilaire Belloc, that the Jews must always constitute an alien nation within a nation, is thus resented. Nevertheless, much as many Jews would like to be completely assimilated into the nations to which they belong, it would not seem as though their ambition is in fact ever realized. They remain *malgré tout,* a community apart, a peculiar people.

If we cannot call the Jews of to-day a race or a nation, can we call them a religion? It would seem not, for the Faith which used to bind all Israelites together has now to a large extent lost its hold upon them, and it is perhaps even doubtful whether a majority of them are now "orthodox Jews", i.e. Jews who believe in the Old Testament, observe the law, including its ceremonial and dietary prescriptions, and remain faithful to the traditions of the elders as enshrined in the Talmud. A great many nowadays are "Reforms Jews" who profess a kind of modernist theism, practically denying the intervention of the supernatural; whilst others, including a majority of the Zionists, are agnostics or atheists, more influenced by Marx than by Moses.

Community thus seems to be the only word which can aptly be used to describe this unique people who, by all ordinary laws, should have died out or been assimilated long since but who yet remain in being, mixed with, yet separate from, the rest of humanity. Their continued existence, like that of the Catholic Church, has something miraculous about it and serves as a perpetual reminder of the Divine intervention in human history and of the fact that when the Messiah "came to His own and His own received Him not." As Dr. John Friedman points out in his interesting book "The Redemption of Israel", the Jews as heirs of the once-chosen race would appear to have a special function to perform in the world, a penitential function, which will continue so long as they continue to reject Christ. This rejection of the Messiah by Israel does not of course imply, as in the case of the Fall, any kind of original sin in the descendents of the culprits—the Jews indeed are entitled to our love and pity as much as any other of the sons of Adam—but, none the less, owing to the species of course that hangs over them, they are in the tragic situation of being unable either to *die,* i.e. to lose the sensation of being a separate community, or to *live,* i.e. to win back the old position of privileged nation which their ancestors forfeited by rejecting Christ. Part of their tragic function, as Dr. Friedman has pointed out, is moreover to assess the degree of Christianity attained by the Gentiles, to be a "thermometer of world evil." This the Jews achieved by confronting the Christian societies with a temptation to diabolical hatred in the form of anti-Semitism. The extent to which Christians have yielded to this temptation is almost inconceivable; Christian ill-treatment of the Jews is one of the chief blots on the Church's history.

The history of the Jews during the 2,000 years which have elapsed

since the catastrophe which befell them as a result of their rejection of Christ has indeed been one long series of persecutions and tragedies. The worst period of all, until we come to the second quarter of the Twentieth Century, was perhaps the period of the Crusades when they were harassed, persecuted and massacred throughout Europe. At this period they were frequently accused (always, it would seem, unjustly) of ritual murder, usually of the use of the blood of a murdered Christian at their Passover ceremonies—in 1171 several Jews were burned alive at Blois on a charge of this kind. During the middle ages they were constantly being expelled from one country or another (no Jews were allowed in England from the time of Edward I to that of Cromwell) and even when they were made use of by princes and governments as diplomats or bankers, a fact which bears witness to their cunning and business acumen, their social position, as Shakespeare's portrait of Shylock suggests to us, was humiliating as well as highly precarious. The Spanish Inquisition—which history shows to have been so much more of a liability than an asset to the Catholic Church —would not seem to have given much trouble, if any, to professing Jews; but the Moranos, or baptized Jews, many of whom had conformed outwardly in order to avoid being penalized or expelled, often felt its full rigour; and even to-day the tradition of the *auto da fé* is one of the chief causes for Jewish anti-Catholic feeling. It is refreshing to be able to record that the Popes on the whole adopted a humane and enlightened attitude towards the Jews, Innocent IV pointing out to the French and Spanish Bishops that they were in a worse plight than their ancestors had been under Pharoah and commanding that they should be treated kindly. But save in their own dominions, these Papal exhortations seemed to produce but little effect. After the Renaissance the position of the Jews throughout Europe gradually improved, but it was not until after the French Revolution that full civic rights were extended to them in most countries of Europe. The XIX century was the most comfortable period for the Jews since early ages, and in the early decades of the twentieth century it might almost have been supposed that anti-Semitism, at least in its more rabid form, was a spent force; but the appalling excesses of the Hitlerite terror showed how wildly illusory any such hopes would have been. During the Second World War, the staggering total of 5,000,000 European Jews were done to death. As Friedman says, "the slaughterer came, the perfect Nazi butcher, who emptied the centres of Orthodox Jewish life in a way that was final."

The chief development in world Jewry since the war has (as we all know) been that of Zionism. The movement was founded by Theodor Herzl, a Hungarian Jewish journalist, who wrote in his private diary in 1897 that a Jewish State had been founded at the Congress of Basle, which had just been held, and that it would be brought into being within 50 years.

No one would have believed him at the time; but his prophecy was vindicated almost to the letter when, in 1948, after the bitter fighting which followed the British relinquishment of their Palestine mandate, an Independent State of Israel was proclaimed and recognized by the United Nations in 1949.

In between whiles, fortune had certainly favoured the Zionist cause in a most unlooked for manner. The Congress of Basle had defined the object of Zionism—to set up in Palestine a home for the Jewish people—and one main objection to this apparently forlorn hope had been removed when the Turks were driven out of the Holy Land by Allenby in 1917. The need felt by the Allies for the moral and material support of the Jews, particularly in Palestine, led the Lloyd-George government to authorize the "Balfour Declaration" whereby the Zionist League were assured of Britain's desire to give facilities for the establishment of a Jewish national home in Palestine. Although the meaning of the word "home" was not defined and, in spite of a clause stating that nothing would be done to prejudice the rights of existing non-Jewish communities in Palestine, the Zionists took the declaration to be equivalent to the promise of an independent Israelite state. It was thus unfortunate that pressed by the hard necessities of war, the British Government should—unknown to the Jews—have already promised the Hashimite rulers the Arab territories of the former Turkish Empire, no mention being made of the exclusion of any part of Palestine.

As a result of making promises so hard to reconcile with each other, Great Britain,—who after the war was given a Mandate to rule Palestine, found herself in a highly embarrassing position. Vain attempts were made to placate both parties; thus on the one hand Transjordania (or Palestine east of the Jordan) was allowed to form itself into an independent kingdom, whilst on the other hand Jewish immigrants from Europe were permitted to enter the country in large numbers, to settle in and cultivate the potentially fertile plains which the Arabs had left untilled and to build large modern cities such as Haifa and Tel Aviv. We need not dwell here on the various compromise solutions of the problem which were proposed to Jews and Arabs alike and which culminated in the Morrison plan of 1947. Suffice it to say that the proposals appealed to neither, and that, as soon as the British, on relinquishing their mandate, left the country in 1948, the guerilla warfare which had continued to smoulder for years flared out into open warfare. It had been generally anticipated that the Jews, faced, not only by the enraged Arabs of Palestine and Transjordan, but by a coalition of five Arab States, would be ignominiously driven into the sea. All the prophets were stultified, however, for the Israelites—well armed and organized—with ruthless bands of terrorists at their disposal—proved more than a match for the ill-equipped Arab forces; and in No-

vember 1948 an armistice was concluded as a result of which Jerusalem is divided between the protagonists, whilst most of Palestine has fallen into Jewish hands. The new State of Israel was recognized by the United Nations in 1949, but what the final outcome will be it is hard to say, though it seems safe to predict that the Arab powers of the Near and Middle East will not be inclined to acquiesce permanently in the driving of a formidable Jewish wedge between the Moslems of Asia and those of Africa. Tens of thousands of Arabs have been driven out of the new State of Israel and the Jewish population, as already stated, now numbers a million. It is, however, constantly on the increase as immigrants, chiefly from the Iron Curtain countries, continue to pour in, many of them imbued with Communist ideas. There is an orthodox element among the new Israel and these talk of rebuilding the Temple as soon as the Old City falls into Jewish hands, but the majority are irreligious although imbued with a feverish patriotism and not devoid of the Messianic spirit. All the plans for partition put forward during the last few years and still under consideration by the United Nations had insisted that the Holy Places should be put under a special international *régime* and it is the earnest desire of the Holy See (as the present Pope has made clear on several occasions) to see this end attained. But although the Arabs would doubtless agree, strong opposition is to be expected from the majority of the Zionists, still in the flush of their unexpected victory and inclined to aggression rather than to compromise.

Dr. Friedman, in his above-mentioned work, sees Jewish history as a four thousand-year old drama in three acts or epochs of which the third is now entering upon its closing scene or phase. In his eyes each phase of Jewish history is a kind of microcosm of the history of the human race: original sin, banishment and punishment. The book shows how, in the first phase of each epoch, Israel sinned deliberately after having been shown clearly what effects would follow disobedience: how, in the second phase, defeat, exile, persecution and the interruption of Divine Worship ensued; and now the third phase is one of salvation, involving in the last two epochs, a material return to Palestine and a spiritual return to God. The end of the third epoch is not yet, but Dr. Friedman believes that, like the others, it will involve a return, both material and spiritual, to Palestine and he is inclined to regard the material return of the Zionist nucleus to the Holy Land, together with the abandonment of Orthodox Judaism by so many and the increasing attraction felt by the finer type of Jew towards Christianity (we may instance such men as Asch, Werfel and Bergson) as signs heralding the spiritual return of which the Ratisbonne brothers were the pioneers. To what extent such apparently excessive optimism may be justified time will show; we know of course that eventually there will be a return, for St. Paul has assured us that God has not finally cast off His people and that the native olive-shoot will again be grafted on to the

wild olive stem; but we have no guarantee that this spiritual return will long precede the end of all things or that it will be accompanied by a material return.

Christianity, as Disraeli once remarked, is the complation of Judaism, and the Jews will never win back their lost peace and their lost honour but by a return to the new Israel which is the Church—that new Israel with its new Shekinah of the Real Presence, its Sacrifices, its Priesthood, its Supreme Pontiff, untiring in its missionary apostolate, mother of Saints. What a contrast (as Dr. Friedman points out) to the Judaism of the Synagogue, a Messianic people without a Messiah, a Sacred Priesthood without Altars, a theocracy without apostolic fervour!

The repentance and conversion of the Jews, when it comes, will testify more to God's glory than that of the Gentiles, for they are the People whom He originally chose to bear witness to His Name, the People of whom He willed to be born as Man. "Salvation is of the Jews" is a truth that still holds.

To become a Christian, after all that his race has suffered at Christians hands, is inevitably a hard step for a Jew to take, a step which may at first seem calculated to wound his pride. But grace can overcome this obstacle, and once he has taken the decisive step, consolations of a unique kind await the converted Jew. Indeed he can feel "at home" in the Church in a more intimate way than can any Christian. For the Incarnate Lord is Himself a true Israelite. His Blessed Mother and all the Apostles were Jewish too: the Christian Bible is Jewish: statues and pictures (by Christian artists and sculptors) of the great Jewish heroes adorn our Churches. Indeed, as Pius XI declared on a famous occasion:— "We are all Semites spiritually."

It seems clear that the Catholic Church which, if its claims are accepted, is seen to be the continuation and fulfilment of the Jewish Church—the new Israel—is the only religious body in existence which could conceivably convert and transform Judaism, welding it into a coherent spiritual whole: and what a blessing it would be should this miracle occur! It would mean the end of anti-Semitism; it would cure the sick soul of the Wandering Jew. Israel is obdurate partly because his pride forbids him to admit that he has committed a crime of the enormity of that imputed to him by Christians. But if he would admit it and confess his fault, peace would return with penitence; and he would realize that even the immensity of that sin is as nothing compared with the immensity of God's Love. Israel would realize too that the ultimate cause of the crime for which his rulers were immediately responsible is the original and actual guilt of all Adam's sons. We are all shameless criminals, all alike guilty of Christ's death. He loves most who is forgiven most, and the exceptional grace enabling the Jews to repent would also enable them perhaps to outshine other Christians in

virtue; there would be a special dignity, as well as pathos, in the Restored Israel, the Prodigal Elder Son at last returned to the fold. How privileged we should be if God would enable us to smoothe the way of return for the people to which He belonged when He trod this earth, and who are not to see Him again until they are ready to cry:— "Blessed is He that cometh in the Name of the Lord."

Hugh Montgomery

The Reunion Movement in Malankara, South India

To speak of a reunion movement, one must start with the causes that lead to the separation. The success or failure of the movement will to a large extent depend on the remedy that is applied to the cause of the wound. The schism will not have always the same cause. So far as the schism in Malankara is concerned, it can be said that it originated not from any differences of doctrine or loyalty to the Pope, the head of the Church. As every schism will lead to heresy, so Protestant ideas did not fail to make their inroads here also.

The Church in Malankara is as old as Christianity itself, being founded by the Apostle St. Thomas. The Apostle landed in Malankara in 52 A.D. and suffered martyrdom at Mylapore in Madras in 72 A.D. His body was at a later date removed to Edessa and now the relic is kept at Ortona, Italy. The Christians in India with right reason desire to get it back to India and the Holy See may be pleased to give it to them when they celebrate the 19th Centenary of the arrival of St. Thomas in Malankara. The first converts of the Apostle were high caste Brahmans. He consecrated bishops and ordained priests from among them. They prefered to call themselves Nazaranees, followers of the man of Nazareth, rather than to be called Christians.

When there were no bishops of their own, they got bishops from the East; and they were always ruled by their own Archdeacon in succession and followed the oriental Syrian Rite.

The Portuguese came to Kerala (Malankara, Malabar and Kerala refer to the same place without much distinction) by the close of the fifteenth century. When they came in power as rulers of the country they began to take interest in the propagation of the Faith. They suspected the bishops from the east of Nestorianism and no more bishops from the east were allowed to land in Malankara. Archbishop Menezes of Goa convened a synod at Diampur in 1599 at which resolutions were passed that Bishops would not be got from the East, and also that the Syriac books would be burned or mutilated. The resolutions were imposed by the Portuguese Government on the people. The mutilation of the rite and the introduction of the Latin rule made the people very much discontended. A bishop from the See of Seleucia in the East was sent at the request of the people, but the Portuguese did not allow him to land in Kerala. Twenty-five thousand people under the leadership of the Archdeacon Thomas had assembled to receive the bishop. A rumour like wild fire was spread among them that the bishop was drowned in the sea. Then and there in a spirit of vengeance they made an oath placing their hands on a cross that was on the spot: neither they nor their children would submit to the (Portuguese) Latin rulers. Their action of vengeance did not stop there. On a prearranged

date representatives from the one hundred and forty-four churches gathered in St. Mary's church at Kuravilangad and installed their leader, Archdeacon Thomas as their bishop with the name Mar Thomas I, twelve priests imposing their hands on him.

They took law into their own hands to gain their end. Next they attempted to get their action rectified by the Holy See. In answer to their repeated petitions, Pope Alexander VII sent in 1656 a carmelite priest, Rev. Joseph Sebastiani, to heal up the Schism. By this time the people had learned the heinousness of their sacriligious action. Yet the line of the bishop Mar Thomas I was continued. 84 churches out of the 144 accepted Rev. Fr. Joseph Sebastiani. The remaining 60 churches continued in the schism, persisting in their demand for the ratification of their action. The Holy See could see them only through the Portuguese eyes, and their grievances were not heeded.

They now began correspondence with the dissident Patriarchs of Antioch and Alexandria to find out whether they could get valid consecration from them for Mar Thomas I. In 1665 the Patriarch of Antioch sent one Mar Gregorios to Malankara. He did not consecrate Mar Thomas. What he did was to make the gulf between the two parties in Malankara wider by introducing divergence of belief between the two parties. The people were thorough confirmed in their belief that St. Peter was the head of the Church and that it was on him that Christ built His Church. They were told that St. Peter established his See in Antioch, and the Antiochean Church was the head and mother of all churches. This satisfied the people and to the verbal differences on doctrines regarding the procession of the Holy Ghost or one nature of Christ, they paid little attention. But they did not get what they wanted from Mar Gregorios. The Patriarch wanted to establish his authority in Malankara before he made their leader a validly consecrated bishop, in Malankara. Occasionally he would send a bishop to Malankara to insert the thin end of the wedge of his full jurisdiction. In 1772 Mar Thomas VI was given consecration with the new title of Mar Dionysius. Mar Kurilos who came in 1846 introduced the Antiochean rite in Malankara.

The authority of the Patriarch of Antioch over the Malankara church has been a moot question. It has often lead the church into litigation. The dissidents entered into communion with the Jacobite Patriarch to get valid consecration which they were given only very late. In the expectation of getting it they accepted the changes that the Patriarch introduced in teachings and rite. Meanwhile the Patriarch had been using every occasion to make firm his foothold in Malankara. This difference in interests has been a cause of perennial confusion in the church.

Attempts at reunion have been at work ever since the unhappy split occurred. Even after entering into alliance with the Patriarch of Antioch

also there were further attempts at reunion. We saw that the St. Thomas' Christians, the Nazaranees, of the most ancient branch of the Catholic Church were not allowed to have their own bishops to rule them and that the rite which was part and parcel of their life was unwantonly tampered with to give place to a rule and rite which were quite foreign to them, and that there were the causes of the schism in Malankara. In accordance with the resolution passed at a public meeting, Mar Thomas IV sent in 1704 through the Vicar Apostolic a petition signed by 12 priests and the representatives of 29 churches to the Holy See, but to no effect. In 1748 Mar Thomas VI joined the Catholic Church, after having been validly consecrated bishop; but when the bishop of Cochin told him most conclusively that he would not be regarded as a bishop, he went back. Mar Dionysius IV made an attempt to join the Catholic Church. But as he was told that he could not be received as a metropolitan which till then he was holding, he gave up his attempts too. Mar Dionysius V also worked for reunion. He visited the Delegate Ayoothi at Oottakamond to talk about reunion. As he was too much involved in litigation he did not succeed in carrying out his plan.

If Mar Thomas I, the accredited leader of all the St. Thomas Christians of Malankara had been consecrated bishop, if the petition of Mar Thomas IV had not misrepresented at the Holy See, the dissidents would not have entered into alliance with the Jacobite Patriarch of Antioch. If Mar Dionysius I who had valid consecration had been given jurisdiction, the Jacobitism in Malabar would have died an early death. If Mar Dionysius IV had been received in office, Protestantism would not have found its way into south India. Many an occasion to end the schism was lost! Many desired to enter the promised land of union with the Holy Church, but they could not. Why? God alone knows!!!

I said above that the Patriarch's authority was a moot question and that it has been a source of trouble and confusion in the Malankara Church. The nature and extent of it has never been defined. Even now it is an open question. Patriarch Abdulla visited Malankara and demanded Mar Dionysius VI, then Metropolitan of Malankara, to execute a registered document recognizing the supreme power of the Patriarch over the temporal affairs of the church as well as spiritual matters. Mar Dionysius refused to do it and the Patriarch excommunicated him. The confusion and litigation that have evolved out of this are not ended. The canonical remedy they found to save themselves from this was to inaugurate the extinct Catholicate of Tigris in Malankara. A Patriarch cannot enter the Province of a Catholicos for ecclesiastical purposes unless he is called. But this did not end all the trouble in Malankara. The separated church is now divided into two parties, the Patriarch's party and the Catholicos' party.

On November 17, 1926 at a synod of all the Bishops on the side of

the Catholicos, His Grace Mar Ivanios now the Archbishop of Trivandrum was authorized to negotiate with the Holy See of Rome to ascertain the possibilities of entering to communion with the Holy Catholic Church. His Grace Mar Ivanios most gladly took up the work. He opened correspondence with the Holy See. He repeated only the same demands from the Holy See that have always been made by the dissidents on every occasion of their approach for reunion. The demands were not many. The reuniting bishops must be received and allowed to continue in their office and jurisdiction and the rite that has come in use in Malankara should be maintained. In August 1930 he got the final answer from the Holy See granting all his demands.

The Holy See took four years to study the various aspects of this question before coming to this final decision. Much water had flowed under the bridge by this time. The Catholicos who had been very enthusiastic about this died. The litigation in the church took a different turn and the whole situation was changed. It became more difficult and the sacrifices greater for the Metropolitan to relinquish his office. Only His Grace Mar Ivanios, the Metropolitan of Bethany and his suffragan His Excellency Mar Theophilos were found ready to join the Catholic Church. They made their profession of faith before the late Most Rev. Dr. Benzigar, bishop of Quilon and were received into the Catholic Church.

Pope Pius XI of happy memory gave 'a big welcome' to His Grace Mar Ivanios on his visit to the Holy Father and the Pope himself invested him with the Pallium. On June 11, 1932 the Holy See erected a new ecclesiastical province for the Syro-Malankara Antiochean rite comprising the two native states of Travancore and Cochin and part of B. Malabar. This province was divided into two dioceses, the Archdiocese of Trivandrum and the diocese of Tiruvalla. Archbishop Mar Ivanios was appointed Metropolitan of Trivandrum and His Lordship Mar Theophilos was appointed bishop of Tiruvalla.

The Catholicos and his party did not want Mar Ivanios to join the Catholic Church alone. Neither did any one in the whole community want it. So when two bishops left them, they consecrated Mar Philexinos and myself to strengthen their fold and to fight the reunion movement. After four years of strenuous labour to build the Jacobite church it became all the more clear to me that the Jacobite church has no foundation and on the 29th of November, 1937 I joined the Catholic Church. Two years later Mar Dioscoros who was the only metropolitan of the Jacobite Cnanaya church made his submission to the Holy See on 12th November 1939. The Holy See, finding that His Excellency Mar Theophilos could not rule the diocese any longer on account of ill health, appointed me Administrator Apostolic with the title of Ingila and conferring all the rights

and privileges of a residential bishop. His Excellency Mar Dioscoros was allowed at his own request to live a retired life in the diocese of Tiruvalla. He went to his eternal reward on February 22, 1943.

The Holy See has recognized the validity of the Holy Orders and other Sacraments received in the Jacobite Church. The reuniting priests and bishops are given precedence in the whole Catholic Hierarchy according to their dates of ordination or consecration in the Jacobite church. As a mark of this when His Grace Mar Ivanios completed twenty-five years of his consecration, the Holy Father sent him an autograph message of congratulation and blessings.

Now that the Holy See has diagnosed the disease and has given the correct medicine, what stands in their way of coming into the true fold? The disease of schism in Malankara has become chronic. Diseases become complicated as they grow old, especially when they are treated by unskilled men. When the Jacobites failed to get the right physician naturally they took others into the service without first ascertaining whether or not he had a licence. The keep-aloof-from-the-non-Catholics policy was enforced all the more rigorously on the Catholics in Malankara. When the Protestants found that the Jacobites were left alone, they offered their help and support, and like a drowning man clutching at a straw the Jacobites welcomed the services offered by the Protestants. The leaven of Protestantism began to work in the dough of the Jacobite community. The Jacobites discovered the poison only too late. The Church Missionary Society from England established itself in Malankara. It drew into its fellowship a good many of the Jacobites. Subsequently a reformed Jacobite church has come into existence. The Protestants are their great benefactors. Inter-marriage among these various communions has become very common. The Jacobite church, while withholding official recognition to these vagaries of faith, countenances them to a great extent. It is too weak to enforce decisive measures on account of confusion and trouble within the church.

Corporate reunion has always been the ideal of the dissidents, and it is so even now. Till a hundred years ago it was possible. The dissidents do not form one church now, much less they are one in faith. In the same house one can find members adhering to different faith and practices. The government also put difficulties in the way of all the Christian bodies uniting under one head. The reuniting individuals or groups of persons have to relinquish all rights to their former possessions, and come away empty handed. Sometimes they are disinherited by their families too. The loss of faith due to Protestant influences, consequent on the keep-aloof policy of their brother Catholics, and the legal difficulties which forbid them to take their former institutions to the new organization have made mass reunion impossible.

By the grace of God and by the special favour of the Holy See cer-

tainly it will be gratifying to learn that in spite of the difficulties stated above, four bishops, eighty priests and over fifty thousand faithful have joined the Catholic Church within the short period of twenty years. The two dioceses mentioned above also work for the conversion of the pagans. These new adherents to the Faith number over twenty thousand.

It now lies with the faithful, both individuals and organizations in the Catholic Church to bring the reunion movement to great glory. The Holy See has done and is doing its part to promote the divine wish of our Lord to bring all sheep into the true fold. The great problem that confronts the movement now is financial. Groups of families often, twenty, thirty and even more sometimes and in some places come ready to be received into the Church. To receive them into the communion of the Catholic Church will mean starting a parish for them with all conveniences for worship, education of their children, the care of the sick and the uplift of the poor. Over two hundred mission stations in both the dioceses are already started. All are not supplied yet with the necessaries of a parish. Applications from the dissidents are forthcoming to receive them into communion with us. These applications are kept pending for want of money to build churches and schools for them. This is a very painful situation. Only the charity of the good Catholics can save the movement from this predicament. The individuals and groups who appreciate the movement and are intellectually convinced that the Catholic Church is the true church but are too timid to take that bold step to break away from their entanglements and they and their number is on the increase, need special grace of God. Their brethren in the Catholic Church must pray for them and sanctify themselves for them.

The field is ripe. The path is clear; only labourers and means are wanting. You can do as a worker or train a priest in your stead; you can build a church; you can pay the patrimony for a religious. Will you do it?

Most Rev. Joseph Mar Severios,
Administrator Apostolic of
Tiruvalla, India.

Rome, June 22nd, 1950

Note: *Unitas* is opening a burse in favor of this promising field of reunion. Address donations to: *Associazione Internagionale Unitas,* Piazza Farnese, 96, Rome, Italy.

Saint Theodore, the Studite, and the Roman Papacy

The relation of the Eastern Church to Rome at the time of the Iconoclastic Controversy is well studied in a close view of one of the great protagonists in the struggle.

Than Theodore of Studium the East has produced few more attractive saints. But though his signal eloquence, his versatility, his wonderful administrative power as shown in being the revered ruler of a thousand monks, his piety and his extraordinary selflessness, mark him out as one among ten thousand; he is for our purpose particularly notable, in that he is so outspoken and fearless a defender of the authority, rights, and freedom of the Church and more especially one of the last great upholders of the *privelegium Petri* and of the Roman See.[1]

Before we enter upon our discussion of the relations of St. Theodore with the Papacy we think it well to sketch the historical background and to say something of the man himself.

"In the south-west corner of the city of Constantinople near the Seven Towers of the Golden Gate, stands the Mosque called Mir-Achor-Djami, formerly the Basilica of St. John of the Studium. Few passing travellers know of its existence, and even archaeological explorers, seeking as a rule either the purely classical or the purely Oriental have given it but little attention . . . Yet those who have studied the early beautiful capitals, with the rich and delicate acanthus foliage and the crossing cornucopias, and have admired the proportions of the Church...cannot acquiesce readily in this loss to all lovers of early Christian art. To those who know even a little of the history of the monastery and of those who have dwelt in it, the desecration and neglect may seem matter for regret but hardly for surprise. For it only reflects the comparative indifference with which at least till recent times, not only the reading public in general but the whole academic world has regarded the post-classical period of Greek history. Yet that period comprises the early development of Christian doctrine and monastic discipline in regions, which, after all, were near to their original home. And both from the point of view of the ecclesiastical investigator and of the more general historian, the part played by Studium is by no means contemptible. It has well been called the "Cluny of the East." Yet in some ways Studium has rendered greater services to the Church and the world than were rendered by Cluny. Like Cluny it became the center and parent of religious life; like Cluny it maintained the cause of spiritual authority against material force: but it had a task far greater from an intellectual standpoint than any which fell singly to any particular monastery of the West, in keeping alive the torch of ancient learning."[2]

The leading questions to be thought out, worked out or fought out

(1) *The Eastern Churches and the Papacy*—Scott—p. 299.

during the latter part of the eighth century and the succeeding period, and also the champions of the rival causes, were on a larger scale and of more general interest than those of the two centuries previous. This becomes manifest if we take a glance at the chief events happening about the time of Theodore's birth. Theodore the Studite, was born in Constantinople in 759.

In Western Europe, Pippin the Frank was fighting against the Saracens in Spain, and by his victories in conjunction with the remains of the Visigothic people, was wresting Narbonne from tne Mohammedans, and thereby restricting their power to the regions south of the Pyrenees. Five years previously in 754, Pippin on receiving the rite of coronation at the hands of Pope Stephen II, had exchanged the title of Mayor of the Palace for that of King of the Franks. Two years later he made that arrangement in Italy which was the beginning of the temporal power of the Papacy. For that year, which, as Dr. Hodgkin has pointed out, almost exactly corresponds with the date—on the other side of our era—of the foundation of Rome, the power which in spite of changes in situation and constitution still claimed to hold the undying authority of the "Respublica,"—had lost all hold on Italy by the fall of the exarchate of Ravenna into the hands of the Lombards (751). The Lombards were soon to be ousted by the Frank, who at first conquered not for himself but for the successor of St. Peter. But the emperors, especially those of the strong Isaurian dynasty that began with Leo III, were not likely to view so serious a loss with equanimity. Whether Italy and the empire would be permanently loosed from the ties, both saecular and spiritual, which had bound them together was still an open question in the early days of Theodore.

Such was the scene in the West. And what happened in the West was closely connected with movements which began in Theodore's native city of Constantinople, and which largely determined the character both of his mind and his fortunes...The Empire was making successful resistance to external foes and internal disorders. Constantine V pursued the general lines struck out by his father Leo III, who had brilliantly repulsed the Saracens from the walls of Constantinople in 718. Henceforth the Omeyyad dynasty declined in power and Christendom was saved from immediate danger. Constantine in his battles with the Saracens, was, speaking generally, most successful.

It seems strange that men of such clear heads, with great organizing

(2) *Theodore of Studium*—Gardner—p. 5.

faculties, patient in carrying out their designs, free to all appearances from petty scruples,—should have entered as they did an enterprise which well nigh cost them their power in the ancient home of their empire, and which aroused an opposition to their policy among the ablest thinkers. Nevertheless such was the Iconoclast Controversy.

The bearings of this conflict on the whole life of the times are paramount. It was most likely about the year 726 that the first edict against images was issued by Leo III. The motive for his action is still an open question. The order was issued on the authority of the Emperor alone. He tried in vain to obtain the assent of the Patriarch Germanus, and as might naturally be supposed the lower classes of people were violently opposed to the proposed changes. Meantime a strong opposition had arisen in the West. Pope Gregory II, at once protested in writing: "That the Emperor ought not to concern himself with matters of faith, nor to change the ancient doctrines of the Church as held by the Holy Fathers".

The iconoclastic policy of Constantine V, seems to have been more thorough-going than his father's. He attempted to gain support for his measures by means of a Church council. What is of more immediate interest for us is the ceaseless warfare waged from this time forward between the iconoclastic emperors and the monks.

Just one word more before we pass from this preliminary sketch to the main study under consideration. Although there had been great upheavals in the realms of culture during the seventh and eighth centuries still in spite of the decadence, in spite of the dangers that had robbed the Eastern Empire of its ancient security and the gradual drifting away of Constantinople from the yet more venerated home of culture and order; still the city where Theodore was born was at the moment the focus of the best civilization that existed and contained within itself enough of the ancient world to vindicate it from any suspicion of encroaching barbarism. For in this city men could still enjoy the refinements of Greek life and admire the masterpieces of Hellenic art as they strolled from the hippodrome and the theatre to the Church and monastery, from the busy wharves of the Golden Horn to the secluded gardens of the Studium.

It is clear, then, that the early days of Theodore were days of great agitation in matters political and ecclesiastical. Constantinople was the great center of all the movements and conflicts of the time—and the family into which he was born was intimately connected, on both sides with the administration of the imperial government and intensely susceptible to religious influences that surrounded them.

Theodore's father, Photinus, hald a post in the imperial treasury. His mother, Theoctista, was a lady of good birth. Theodore seems to have had three brothers, like-minded with himself in religious matters. Theodore's

maternal uncle, Plato, was able to work his way up by diligence and industry—becoming first a notary, then a clerk of the imperial exchequer. Plato had a decided influence on the whole life of Theodore.

The zeal of Theodore for knowledge as he conceived it, and his familiarity with the Scriptures and the Greek Fathers, is evident through his writings. His quiet years of study lasted until his early twenties.

Theodore's father's office must have been a lucrative one, and so it is probable that the Studite had no actual need to earn a livelihood. Of one fact we are sure—that he mixed in the upper society of Constantinople, and acquired that knowledge of men and affairs, with habits of courtesy and social tact which mark his correspondence. Possibly to those who do not realize the excessive and scrupulous etiquette and ceremony that distinguish Byzantine society, his urbanity may seem to have a tinge of servility. In any case, Theodore learned in early life to know men and society, and was not an alien to the aristocratic world in which he was obliged later to seek partisans.

The ideals of Theoctista were by no means of a mundane character, and her strenuous piety and resistance to worldly ideals and practices of her neighbors was encouraged by the reputation and influence of her brother Plato, although during the days of persecution he was not able to show himself openly in Constantinople. Plato had early conceived a desire to flee the world, and his execution of that desire was somewhat dramatic. He left Constantinople with one servant, crossed the straits, had his head shorn by his attendant, put on vile garments, and sent the attendant back to the city. Plato then preceeded to the monastery of Symboli, in Bythinia —where he became a monk. As time went on he never relaxed either in active labors or private discipline. In the course of time his reputation grew and on the death of the abbot—Theoctistus—Plato was chosen to succeed to the office.

At Saccudio, Theodore made his novitiate under his holy uncle Plato and up till his thirty-fifth year worked in all things with and under the abbot's guidance.

With the endeavor of Constantine VI, to obtain the blessing of the Church on his illegal union with Theodote, a lady-of-honor of his mother's, we are brought into contact with Theodore as a staunch defender of the law of God. On this occasion Theodore was exiled to Thessalonica. The Emperor Constantine had repudiated his lawful wife Marie and had contracted an adulterous union with Theodote, a relative of Theodore. Notwithstanding the conciliatory attitude of the Patriarch Tarasius the Saint never wished to recognize this marriage and broke with the Emperor.[3]

---

(3) *Analecta Bollandiana*—32 (1913)—pg. 439.

"The attitude of Tarasius was an example of the degradation of will and slavery of the whole episcopate to the whims of the Emperors and such actions could not help but arouse the noble spirit of Theodore. These tergiversations of a craven patriarch were disgusting. No doubt there were some noble exceptions among the monks. It should be carefully borne in mind that their *knowledge* is not in question. On this score bishops and monks were ahead, as a rule, of their brethren in the West. This is one of the things that startles the student of the Ecclesiastical literature of the Two Churches at this period. In the East there is no such suspension of literary activity as we know to have lasted in the West from the period of the Germanic invasions till the magnificent efflorescence of the Middle Ages. But the Latin Church had one incontestable superiority over its rival; it had one center of gravity, Rome, and always recognized the papacy as the visible head of the Church. The ecclesiological doctrine of the Eastern Church, on the contrary, is very rudimentary."[4] With the exception of St. Gregory of Nazianzus, St. Theodore, the Studite and a few other examples the bishops and theologians of the Greek Church seldom touch on the primacy of Peter.

But to return to Theodore. At the time that the Studite and his saintly uncle Plato were exiled for their brave antagonism Theodore's brother, the future archbishop, was exiled to Thessalonica. Assuredly the Saint could have appealed to the Pope to ask him to pronounce in his favor; but in none of the letters written at this period, nor in the funeral eulogies of his mother and of his uncle Plato is there any mention of an appeal at this time. This exile, the first of three in his life-time, lasted a few months. A palace revolution brought death to the emperor and return for Theodore—at this time the Saint received from the Pope congratulations on his courage.

"Meantime the Arabs were ravaging the country, and it seemed safer to move to Constantinople. Thus it was that Theodore brought his monks to the Studion, a monastery named after its founder, the consul Studius, and whence Theodore derived his title "the Studite". The years of peace and wonderful activity of the varied intellectual life of the Studion were at last broken in upon when the Patriarch Tarasius died in 806 and the Emperor Nicephorus made choice of a namesake a layman, to succeed him. Plato and Theodore were indignant that after only a few days, Nicephorus was rushed through all the Sacred Orders to the Episcopate. For their opposition they were given twenty-four days in prison, while Joseph, the priest who had blessed the unlawful marriage of Constantine, the pre-

(4). *Catholic Encyclopedia*—VI, 763, a.

vious emperor, was recalled, his office of grand steward restored to him, and his priesthood revived."[5]

At this time a synod was decided upon by the emperor, and this, which Theodore stigmatised as the "second synod of the adulterer", decreed that the second marriage of Constantine VI was lawful, since a dispensation had been granted, that emperors were not subject to the law of the Church and that the examples of St. John Baptist and St. John Chrysostom were useless and valueless to justify the opposition of the monks, that each bishop had authority over the canons and could dispense from them.[6]

Here it is easy to understand that the question of doctrine is paramount and that recourse to Rome is very natural. The question had now become, not a mere matter of ecclesiastical discipline but one of the very foundations of the Church.

It is then, during the second exile, while Theodore is at Chalki that we have some letters to Pope Leo. From his prison he dispatches the Archimandrite to Rome. His first intention was to entrust him with a letter; but fearing lest the letter should fall into the hands of his persecutors, he made known the contents of the letter to Epiphanius and then destroyed it.[7] The report, then, of Epiphanius to Pope Leo was oral.

A short time later another letter which has been preserved was sent to the Sovereign Pontiff, and this message is inscribed:—

"To the most holy and great Father of Fathers, to our Lord Leo, apostolic Pope, Theodore, the most humble priest and abbot of the Studion."

The letter is a clear testimony to the universality of the jurisdiction of the Roman Pontiff:

"Since it is to the great Peter that Christ our God gave the keys of the Kingdom of heaven and entrusted the dignity of chief of the flock, it is to Peter, that is to say his successor, that one ought to submit every innovation which is made in the Catholic Church by those who turn aside from the truth. That is what we humble and lowly monks have learned from the ancient Fathers. Therefore a new teaching having arisen recently in midst of our Church here, we believed we ought, first through the medium of one of our fathers, the most holy archimandrite Epiphanius, and then by this simple letter, to submit it to the angel of your supreme Beatitude.

"There has been held, O Ruler divine of all rulers, a synod of pre-

---

(5) *The Eastern Churches and the Papacy*—Scott—pg. 300.

(6) PG XCIX 1017, Ep. I, 33.

(7) PG XCIX 1028, Ep. I, 34.

varicators, as saith the prophet Jeremias, a council of adulterers. These men have not been content to conspire in favor of the priest who blessed the adulterous marriage and to receive him into communion, but meriting the name of perfect heretic, have excommunicated in a second synod all those who do not cleave to their error, but rather to the Catholic Church itself."[8]

From this same letter we also have a very strong testimony to the supremacy of the jurisdiction of the Roman Pontiff. After commenting on the way the late synod set aside all law the Saint continues:

"I borrow now the cry of the *coryphaeus* of the apostles, calling Christ to his succor when the waves of the sea were risen up, and I say to your Blessedness who art the Representative of Christ 'O First Shepherd of the Church which in under heaven,' save us now, we perish. Imitate the Christ your Master, stretch out your hand to your Church as He stretched out His hand to Peter. Peter began to sink in the waves, whilst our Church is still once more submerged in the depths of heresy. Emulate, we beg you, the great Pope whose name you bear, and just as he on the appearance of the Eutychian heresy, stood erect spiritually as a lion with his dogmatic letters, so in your turn (I dare to say it because of your name) roar divinely, or rather send forth your thunders against the present heresy. For if they, usurping the authority which does not belong to them, have dared to convene a heretical council, while *those who, following ancient custom, have not even the right of convoking an orthodox one without your knowledge,** it seems absolutely necessary; we dare to say it to you, that Your Divine primacy should call together a lawful council, so that the Catholic Dogma may drive away the heresy and that neither your primacy may be anathematised with all the orthodox by these new voices without authority, nor that wills evilly disposed may find in this adulterous council an excuse for being involved in sin. It is in order to obey Your Divine authority as Chief Pastor that we have set forth these things as it befitted our nothingness, we the least members of the Church. For the rest we beg your Holiness to count us among your sheep and to enlighten and to strengthen us by your holy prayers... It is of myself a humble fisherman held in prison, that I write to you this letter, because my Father and companion the monk, as well as my brother the Archbishop of Thessalonica, are imprisoned in the other islands. But they say the same things as I, and with me prostrate themselves at the sacred feet of Your Blessedness."[9]

---

(8) PG XCIX 1017, Ep. I, 33.
*Author's italics.
(9) PG XCIX 1020, Ep. I, 33.

Neither is the Saint's testimony to the Pope's supremacy of jurisdiction confined to his letters to the Holy See. He stands forth as the same brave witness in his Catechesis. For, after condemning the deceivers in the East, he continues his instruction at follows:

"But they have not led astray those who are strengthened and invigorated by immutable truth. By no means have they escaped without arguing with the supreme throne of the Church, and accordingly it came to pass as you also know. And all these things were safe and secure for us, e v e n before the coming of those from the West. Whence it often happens, as has happened in previous ages, as we know, that God watches over the bishops amongst us and bears testimony before the eyes of all—that they are his enemies who deny His image. For if they are cut off from the *coryphaeus* and by the other three patriarchs, they are also cut off by Christ who is the head of the fore-ordained; and thus weeping befits their cause, whilst great rejoicing becomes ours."[10]

From Epiphanius Theodore learned that his adversaries at Rome were at work insinuating that he himself was involved in heretical compromises.[11]

In a new letter which he entrusted to Epiphanius he is at pains to prove his orthodoxy:

"It is strange that we who suffer for the Catholic Faith should have heretical sentiments. Silence to every mouth that accuses us and calumniates us. We are orthodox although sinners, O Blessed Father, and we profess without any alteration the apostolic Faith. We recognize every general council and private one if it is approved, with all the holy canons that are enacted there; we detest and anathematise all heresies and heretics. Anathema to Barsanuphius, Isaias, Dorotheus, and Dosethius whom the holy Sophronius anathematised...As for us we are pure from every heretical sentiment, thanks to your most holy prayers, O most venerable of Fathers."[12]

A point to be noted here is that the opponents of Theodore were compelled to recognize the power and authority of Rome, since they are careful to have their representations made at the papal throne.

At the same time that Epiphanius was bringing Theodore's message to the Pope he was carrying a folio to the Archimandrite Basil, who was living at Rome. By the intervention of Basil, he asked Pope Leo to convene a council to decide the doctrinal question and to condemn the partisans of the adultery.

---

(10) PG XCIX 1289, Ep. II, 66.

(11) *Analecta Bollandiana*—32 (1913)—pg. 140

(12) PG XCIX, 1028, Ep I, 34.

A short time after this the Emperor Nicephorus met his death on the field of battle—July 26, 811. He was succeeded by his son who reigned for only two months. The accession of Michael Rhangabe followed. The new Emperor Michael tried with the aid of the Sovereign Pontiff to effect a reconciliation between Theodore and the Patriarch Nicephorus. The letter written on this occasion by the Pope and the personal proposals of Michael brought about the desired effect. The priest Joseph was deposed at the request of Theodore. Nicephorus and Theodore renewed a friendship which was to perdure.

Meanwhile a second Iconoclastic persecution breaks out. Leo the Armenian, a successful general against the Bulgarians, usurped the crown in 813 and in 815 he began a persecution of the orthodox Christians. He forced the Patriarch to abdicate and intruded Theodatus into the See of Nicephorus. The patriarchial chair was held by Iconoclasts till 842. A Synod of Constantinople condemned the Seventh General Council, and while the images in the churches were broken, those who honored them were visited with stripes, imprisonments and even death itself. Saint Theodore was scourged and banished and then from his exile in concert with other abbots he wrote the Pope informing him of the distress of the Eastern Churches.

"It is then, during the reign of Leo the Armenian and under very critical circumstances that Theodore, the Studite, renewed his appeals to the Holy See. We possess two of his letters addressed to Pope Pascal. To establish the time of these it is necessary to say a few words about the chronology of the third exile of Theodore. It was shortly after Easter that Theodore was compelled to quit the Studion and was sent to Metopa, on the confines of Bithynia and Phrygia. The old division of the Empire into provinces had gradually been superseded by the system of "themes"—which was more military in character, and each was ruled by an official with the title of "Strategus". Metopa was probably in the Opacian theme. The Emperor soon decided that this was too near Constantinople. In constant communication with the capital the hegumenos sent letters in every direction to sustain the image-worshippers. Probably during the month of May he was removed to Bonita, which was certainly of the Anatolic theme. At Bonita he passed three full years. Was it discovered that even this removal was not distant enough? At any rate, in the following June he had taken the road to Smyrna, in the Thracensian theme. Here he remained a prisoner for twenty months and for a time at least was cooped up and subjected to considerable privation. Was it from Smyrna he sent the letters addressed to Pascal? This Pope ascended the Papal throne of Peter,—January 25, 817. It should be noted that Theodore had scarcely arrived at Smyrna when he received a communication that some have

wrongly regarded as an indirect answer to his second letter. It seems at first sight that the two letters to Pope Paschal were written from Bonita. Still some circumstances are not so favorable to this view. The two missives were sent in the collective name of the Abbots of Cathare, of Picridion, of Paulopetrion and of Studion. For the first of the two letters Theodore could have consulted the signers. The same cannot be so easily said for the second. If both had been entirely composed at Bonita and sent from there we can scarcely explain the language of Theodore. It is for this reason that some have supposed that the first letter was written at Metopa and that it was addressed to the reigning Pope. When the courier arrived at Rome Paschal would have been elected and the letter would have been given to him. This solution, however, seems to demand a slight modification. Had Theodore written from Metope in the latter part of June 816, he should have supposed that Leo was still on the throne of Peter, and it is surprising that he does not recall so much as a word of his relations with Leo some years before. On the other hand, the monk Denys who conveyed the message certainly set out from Bonita. A letter written about the time Theodore was to exchange his residence at Metope for a new prison seems to confirm this opinion. In the light of the evidence at hand, then, we prefer to accept the following theory. Before leaving Metope Theodore could have communicated his project to the signers of the letter; but the final wording and the sending find him at Bonita. Probably St. Theodore had been informed of the nomination of a new Pope. This Pope, who took the name of Stephen V, departed, shortly after his consecration, upon a journey to France. In the month of August he was on his way. In October he had his first interview with Emperor Louis. Returning to Rome during November he ordained during the following month. On the twenty-fourth of January he was dead. Supposing the messenger of Theodore in Italy during the month of December, it is not surprising that, simple monk that he was—he did not obtain an immediate audience with the newly elected Pontiff. The sickness and sudden death of the Pontiff forced him to await the election of Paschal. This appears to us the most satisfactory explanation."[13]

In the first of these letters we have a striking testimony to the Divine Right of the Papacy. To quote but one passage:

"Your Supreme Blessedness has doubtless learnt what misfortune ours sins have drawn upon our Church. We have become, to speak according to the Scripture, the conversation and proverb of all the nations, but maybe You have not yet been fully informed by letter. This is why we humble monks and the least among the members of Christ, since our chief is a prisoner, and the first among our fathers are scattered hither and yon,

---

(13) *Analecta Bollandiana* 32 (1913) pg. 444

have been able, thanks to our common agreement in mind and expression, to write you this letter, though it be very bold. Listen to us, O Apostolic Leader, set over by God to be the guide of the Sheep of Christ, Doorkeeper of the Kingdom of Heaven, Rock of the Faith, on which has been built the Catholic Church. For You are Peter, You are the Successor of Peter, whose See You occupy with honor. The wild wolves break in upon the fold of Christ, the gates of Hell as of old attack. How? Christ and His Mother and the servants of God suffer persecution. For the persecution of the image is an attack upon the prototype. Hence the detention of the chief Patriarch, the exiles and imprisonments of archbishops and priests, of monks and nuns, iron bands, torture and even death itself. O the blasphemy! The most venerable image of the Savior, before which even the devils tremble is visited with contumely and insult, not only in the capital but even in the villages and towns. Altars have been desecrated, temples destroyed, shrines profaned, blood has been shed, yes, the blood of those who have kept the Gospel. Persecution and exile is in store for those who remain. Every pious mouth is silenced by the fear of death, the blasphemous and evil tongue is free to wag. Chaos reigns. . . ."

"Such is our lot, O Your Beatitude. . . . Come to our assistance, arise and do not repulse us till the end. To You Christ our God said, 'When thou art once converted, strengthen thy brethren'. Now is the time and place. Help us You who have been set by God for that purpose. Stretch out the hand as far as possible. Frighten, we beg You, the monsters of heresy with the flute of Your Divine speech. O Good Shepherd, we conjure Thee, give Your life for your sheep. May the Church which is under heaven learn that those men are smitten with anathema, they who have this audacity and who anathematise our holy Fathers. You would do a work thereby pleasing to God, it would be a joy for the saints and the angels, a support for those who waver, a confirmation for those who are strong, a resurrection for those who have fallen, a joy for all the orthodox Church, and for Your Primacy, according to the expression of those of old, an eternal memory."[14]

Knowing that Theodotus, the patriarch intruded into the place of the dethroned Nicephorus, had sent messengers to Rome, hoping to influence the Pope in his favor, St. Theodore penned the following lines to the Sovereign Pontiff:

"From the height of heaven the glittering sun of the morning has sent its rays, Christ our God has established Your Blessedness in the West on the first Apostolic See as a divine torch for the illumination of the Church which is under heaven. Yes, we behold Your spiritual light, who are sur-

(14) PG XCIX, 1152, Ep. II, 12.

rounded by the shadows and mortal darkness of a perverse heresy. But we scattered the mist of our sadness, we opened our hearts to the radiant hopes, when we learnt from our brethren sent to You all the great things said and done by your Holy Primacy. You did not admit to Your Sacred Presence the heretical deputies, but you sent them back when they were yet far off. On the other hand, You sympathized with our misfortunes as with misfortunes of Your own sheep; our letters being read and our messengers heard immediately. And, indeed, we humble monks recognize as evident Successor of the Prince of the Apostles the Bishop who presides over the Church of Rome, and we are certain that God has not abandoned the Church of our country, because Divine Providence has reserved for it from the beginning, in the present conjunctures, His assistance which He gives by You and by You alone. For You are truly the Source always pure from the beginning and always clear, of Orthodoxy: you are the tranquil port where the whole Church finds sure shelter against all the storms of heresy, You are the Citadel chosen by God to be the assured Refuge of Salvation."[15]

What was the outcome of these negotiations? Paschal did not answer the first letter, he satisfied himself by giving a viva voce encouragement to the messengers.[16]

It is clear that Theodore's aim at the time he wrote his second letter to Pope Paschal was to have the Emperor Louis to intervene personally. If this result was not attained Theodore obtained a compensation. Pope Paschal dispatched an embassy to Byzantium. The envoys were to give the emperor an official document which was a justification of the cult of holy images. The knowledge of this document gave St. Theodore the greatest joy. The iconoclasts are definitely condemned.

"Byzantium has shaken off the yoke of the Gospel as a heifer pricked by the goad; she shakes off the harness. She is furiously agitated in the manner of the Corybantes; she is intoxicated with blood as a lioness; as the serpent she stops her ears, she kicks against the censure."

"A Voice made itself heard to warn her, equal to a voice from heaven, the Voice of the Supreme Throne of Rome, What hast thou done? Thou hast denied Christ by denying His Image, that of the Mother of God and of all the saints. Open your ear to obedience, listen to the words of the Gospel, of apostle, of prophet, of father. But Byzantium did not listen. She raised her head against Almighty God, outraging Christ and trampling upon His chosen saints."[17]

In a letter to the emperor Michael after he has paid a deserved tribute

---

(15) PG XCIX, 1153 & 1156, Ep. II, 13.
(16) *Analecta Bollandiana*—32 (1913)—pg. 445.
(17) *The Eastern Churches and the Papacy*—p. 307.

to the decree for the liberation of the exiles, he begs him to allow the cult of holy images and to renew the union with the Holy See.

"The Catholic Church," he writes, "since the time of the preaching of the apostles, as paintings and inscribed monuments testify, bears and venerates in the temples and on the vessels and sacred vestments the holy image of Christ, of the Mother of God, of the angels and saints. And yet our Church has lately separated from the four patriarchs, and without reason has violated the Christian law. But here is the favorable time. O Emperor, friend of Christ, here is the day of salvation, here is the moment for being reconciled with Christ under the auspices and mediation of your authority amicable to peace, the moment for us to unite ourselves to the Church of Rome, *coryphaeus* of all the Churches of God, and by her to the three patriarchs; the moment to glorify with unanimous voice God the Father with the Son and the Holy Ghost, and to solemnise your most pious and deserved royalty."[18]

The Emperor hoped to settle the problem by calling an assembly of Iconoclasts and Catholics. Against this St. Theodore stood firm. He claims that in such a question which concerns God Himself, not even Peter or Paul, or one of the angels from heaven would dare to make an innovation that would spell ruin over the Gospel.

In a letter, written according to Baronius in 821, St. Theodore addresses the Emperor in the following terms:

"And if there is anything about which your Majesty doubts or distrusts your holy patriarch can offer a solution, and may that mighty and God-strengthened hand command as imitator of God for the good of all. Order that the exposition of faith sent from old Rome be received, following what has been the practice from all time by our fathers. For this Church, O Emperor, imitator of Christ, is the *supreme* of all the Churches of God. Peter is its first Bishop, to whom the Lord said: 'thou art Peter; and upon this rock I will build my Church, and the gates of hell shall not prevail against it."[19]

Theodore's advice, however was not followed, and later he left the capital, never to return. In exile he breathed his last as his disciples, reading the Psalms to him, came to the appropriate words "I will never forget Thy commandments, for by them thou hast given me life."

Theodore had carried on the great tradition of the Studion, a tradition of unswerving Orthodoxy and loyalty to the Holy See. A leader of the Image-worshippers in Iconoclastic times, the Hegumenos Theodore was one of the last defenders of union and the Pope's rights before the great schism.

George A. Morgan, S. J.

(18) PG XCIX, 1310, Ep. II, 74
(19) PG XCIX, 1332 Ep. II, 86.

Nicholas Cabasilas

In recent years the works of Nicholas Cabasilas have been studied with fresh interest. An essay on the Italian translation of *Life in Christ,* his principal work, has appeared in *Vita Cristiana.* In the collection of *Sources Chrétiennes,* Salaville has published the French translation of the *Explanation of the Divine Liturgy* preceded by an extensive introduction in which the life, writings, and spiritual doctrine of the illustrious Byzantine are studied masterfully.[1]

It is evident that after six centuries this lay theologian of the dissident Oriental Church still has something to say, not only to the studious, but to all good Christians. In fact, the Italian and French translations are destined to that quite large circle of souls who wish to nourish their spiritual life with the reading of works which search into the vivifying principles of dogma. Wherefore, it seems fitting to give some consideration of the life, writings and spiritual doctrine of this mystic, with special regard to the fine introduction which Salaville has added to his translation.

I. LIFE.

The life of Nicholas Cabasilas is one of those which test the patience of the most accomplished biographer. Neither the precise date of his birth (1290 ?) nor of his death (1371 ?) are known, and the chronicles of the time attribute to the name of Nicholas Cabasilas such contradictory characteristics that Salaville, in an attempt to explain them logically, has arrived at the hypothesis that some of them are to be attributed to another author of the same name as the author of the *De Vita in Christo.*

He introduces his distinction upon the basis of the term "Sacellarius" used of a Paleogist and Barlaamite, and of another of "Kamactos" which would be applicable to our mystic, nephew of the famous Nilo Cabasilas.[2] A more certain judgment can be made only when the correspondence of Cabasilas is published. However, the hypothesis of Salaville appears to be sufficiently well founded. It is certainly more in keeping with the temperament of the author of the spiritual works whose fame has lasted until our day. Wherefore Cabasilas would no longer be an opportunist, a calculating and unscrupulous politician who was first Paleogist, and then Cantacuzenist. Neither would he be an unstable theologian, first Barlaamite and then Palamite, as some have recently repeated.

We may accept the following dates as certain: he was ambassador of the Thessalonians to Manuel Cantacuzene in 1346. He was to have shared the retreat in a monastery which the emperor, weary of his harrassed life, intended to make in 1349. The plan was not realized, and apparently he did not either become a monk. Finally in 1354 he was proposed as Patri-

1. Cf. *Vita Cristiana,* Vol XVI (1947) Fasc. I. Translation by Prof. E. Piovesan.

2. Nicolas Cabasilas, *Explication de la Divine Liturgie;* Introduction et traduction de S. Salaville, A.A.; Edition du Cerf, 29 Blvd. de la Tour Maubourg, Paris; Editions de l'Abeille 9, rue Mulet, Lyons, 1943.

arch of Constantinople by the Bishops, but was not elected. From this time on history is silent. Many have repeated, but without any foundation, that he was Archbishop of Thessalonica.[3] The motive for this supposition may lie in the strangeness of a layman leaving us the magnificent spiritual works and homilies, which in part we shall attempt to study.

His spiritual doctrine reveals him as a soul rich in the science of divine things, and capable of interesting profoundly the Fathers of Trent and Bossuet.

II. WRITINGS.

Besides the De *Vita in Chriso,* and the *Interpretatio divinae Liturgiae* of Cabasilas, some *Orationes* have been published. Among the latter are the extremely interesting Marian *Orationes* edited by Jugie in Volume XIX of the Oriental Patrology.

Whether he deals with the Mystical Body and Its relation to the Eucharist, or whether he speaks of the liturgical mysteries and the privileges of Mary, profound thought and evocative expressions are never wanting to the Byzantine Theologian.

a) De Vita in Christo.

The Christian life is a life in Christ (Book I). It is a life which is begun here below and continues in Heaven.

Life in Christ, or supernatural life is given at Baptism (Book II). It is increased with the unction of Confirmation (Book III), and is perfected with the Eucharist (Book IV).

Book V is a sort of digression. It deals with the symbolism of the consecration of the altar. Cabasilas emphasizes the special role of Christ in our sanctification.

Book VI shows what our cooperation should be in the action of Christ which remains the spiritual action. Here spiritual doctrine gives way to dogma. Finally he describes the degrees of transformation attained by the Christian soul if it makes good use of the holy Sacraments (Book VIII).

To remain with Christ it is necessary to pass where He has passed, suffer what He has suffered. The Word was made Flesh; and thus, He, God by nature, has deified human nature, a Man like us, He died and rose again.

We receive Baptism so as to participate in His death and resurrection.

3. Cf. S. Salaville, *Cabasilas le Sacellaire et Nicolaus Cabasilas,* in *Echos d'Orient,* 1936, p. 421, 427; *Brevis notitia de Nicolao Cabasilas eiusque liturgico-spirituali doctrina,* in *Eph. Liturgicae,* 1936, pp. 384 ff. The same arguments are reproduced in the Introduction to the translation of the work of Cabasilas: *Interpretatio divinae liturgiae,* published by Salaville in *Editions du Cerf,* Paris, 1943, also in shortened form in *Dictionnaire de spiritualité,* in art. *Cabasilas* (Fasc. VII, 1-9).

4. Hypothesis repeated by M. Lot-Borodine, *Initiation à la mystique sacramentaire de l'Orient, Revue de sciences ph. et th.* XXIV (1935) p. 675, n. I and by S. Broussaleux in the introduction to his translation of *De vita in Cristo* (La vie en Jesus-Christ, Prieuré d'Amay-sur-Meuse, Belgique, 1931) basing himself on the article of L. Petit, *Les Eveques de Thessalonique,* in *Echos d'Orient,* Paris, 1901, V. 94. corrected by the author himself with the article *Le Synodicon de Thessalonique, Echos d'Orient,* XVIII, 1918, 254 ff.

We receive Confirmation to participate in the royal unction of His divinity. We partake of the Eucharist to communicate in all reality with His Flesh and His Blood.

With Baptism the soul lives a divine life, which makes us capable of superhuman acts, as, for example, the heroic charity of the martyrs.

Confirmation confers upon us the Holy Ghost to put into activity the spiritual faculties established within us by Baptism which causes us to live in Christ. Yet Cabasilas seems not to comprehend the doctrine of the *character*, and speaks of repeating the Sacrament of Confirmation.

He teaches forcefully the necessity and the effects of the Eucharist. Human cooperation with the gifts of God is required, and this consists in our conforming to the will of God. This conformation is obtained by means of mental prayer and meditation which cause us to reflect upon the life of Christ, upon his benefits, his mysteries, His love. It causes us to make ours the Sentiments of Christ, and to separate us from earthly sentiments. In this wise our life, little by little falls under the rule of the evangelical beatitudes, and above all conforms itself to Christ, the ideal model of man.

Cabasilas allows us to taste the beauty of holy abandon, and arouses the desire for pure love. He knows how to do this while avoiding the pitfalls of quietism.

b) Interpretatio Divinae Liturgiae.

Following step by step the prayers and ceremonies performed by the priest in the sacred rite, he comments mystically upon the Byzantine liturgy. This passage constitutes a rich commentary in dogmatical concepts. Salaville has studied this text and annotated it with inspiring observations in the foot-notes and at the ends of chapters.

Cabasilas affirms clearly that the essential act of sacrifice is consecration, and the end of sacrifice is the sanctification of the faithful. The Liturgy sanctifies Christians, not only through its teaching of the way of perfection and holy readings, but principally because, taken in itself in its ritual whole, it signifies and reenacts the whole economy of the redemptive order. Its salutary and sanctifying effects flow from the liturgical re-living of Christ.

Cabasilas inculcates this concept with his detailed explanation of each ceremonial act. He dwells upon the *Protesis* or *Proskomidia* (rite of preparation of the offering, developed especially in the thirteenth and fourteenth centuries) and upon the invocation of peace, which he extols at length, and with such profundity that Salaville is moved to remark upon the likeness to the writings of St. Augustine.

His comments upon the Eucharistic Anaphora in his Trinitarian rhythmus is noteworthy: The Anaphora is a thanksgiving to God the Father for having given us an eternal being and destiny, and to God the Son because He has come to redeem us, and who "on that night in which

He was betrayed" instituted the great Mystery. Here occurs the account of the Institution of the Holy Eucharist, and the repetition of the Savior's words of consecration. He recounts all that the Son has done for us. The thanksgiving to the Holy Ghost follows, of Whom he invokes the coming a) upon the bread and the wine to consecrate them, and b) upon the faithful, especially upon those who communicate, to sanctify them.

He underlines well and forcefully that the consecration of the bread and wine by which it becomes the Body and Blood effects the sacramental sacrifice by virtue of divine omnipotence, of the efficacity of the words of the Savior, and of the intervention of the Holy Ghost.

With this last affirmation arises an interesting problem of liturgical theology.

Salaville has copiously annotated Chapter 2 in which Cabasilas maintains against "some Latins" the necessity of the Epiclesis for the consecration of the species. Salaville attempts to demonstrate, that in spite of the exaggerated polemics of our Byzantine, a benevolent liturgical interpretation may be given to his theory of the Epiclesis. This interpretation which makes evident the appropriation of sanctification to the Holy Ghost, permits one to find a point of agreement with the Latins. In this wise he defends the concordance established by Cabasilas with the Latin prayer *"Jube haec perferri"*.

Other chapters follow which contain interesting theological notes on the divine royalty of Christ, on the subject of the Holy Eucharist, its necessity (necessitas medii, says Cabasilas), on the different modes of receiving it. Annotating a study of why the sacred gifts are blessed after the consecration, Salaville shows the agreement of Cabasilas with Bossuet, who reasons as follows: a) because those who should receive them must believe; b) those who merely contemplate them must understand how they are overflowing with benedictions; c) finally, to bless the members of the Mystical Body of Christ who offer themselves in sacrifice.

One failing, however, is evident in Cabasilas: liturgical ultrarealism. Yet the relationship of the Holy Sacrifice with the Church is interesting. The Sacrifice benefits all, even if the minister is unworthy, but more fruitful for the living as well as for the dead is the Mass of the holy priest.

Cabasilas is antagonistic to the word "Purgatory", but not to the substance of the dogma. The eucharistic sacrifice benefits those who still are in need of remission of sins or of purification.

He polemicizes against his dissident oriental contemporaries who hold that it benefits also the blessed, almost as if they were not in *"statu termini"* and gives the correct interpretation of prayer offered in favor of the saints. It is done only to obtain an accidental increase of their glory.

Finally, he throws into relief the mediation of the saints, after that of Christ the Redeemer. Salaville's translation will be very useful to those

wishing an explanation of the Byzantine Liturgy. Alongside the mystico-theological explanation of Cabasilas, is found the theologico-liturgical explanation of Salaville, and they complement one another.

Before making a summary of Cabasilas' principles of spiritual doctrine, we permit ourselves here, together with the illustrious Augustinian, to open a parenthetical discussion on the Marian Homilies.

c) *The Marian Homilies.*

The Marian Homilies were edited by Jugie in volume XIX of the Oriental Patrology of Graffin-Nau.

Perhaps the opinion that Nicholas Cabasilas had been a bishop is to be found in this; it seems inconceivable that a layman could write homilies, and indeed, such theologically profound ones, furthermore stripped of the usual hortatory trappings as these are. They form a work of great value, worthy of one who was proposed for the patriarchal throne of Constantinople.

According to Jugie, "Cabasilas s'y montre théologien profonde et originale autant que styliste consommé. . . . Et pour la théologie, on relévera deux ou trois considerations plus brillantes que solides. Mais pris dans leur ensemble, ces trois discours méritent d'être classés au premier rang des productions similaires. Personne à Bysance, même ailleurs, du moins à la même époque, n'a mieux parlé de la Mère de Dieu que notre orateur."[5]

In the discourse on the Nativity of the Blessed Virgin Mary, Cabasilas emphasizes the original sanctity and the absolute impeccability of the Mother of God. The discourse on the Annunciation treats of her function as cooperator in the salvation of mankind. Of the three discourses, the most important is that on the "Dormition" or the Assumption in which he returns to the points of those preceding and reveals Mary placed with Jesus at the peak of the divine plan, at the summit of all the Creator's works.

This signifies placing the Assumption in the order of theological principles, and hence vests this homily with a certain timeliness.

The fundamental thought which it pleases the Byzantine theologian to develop, and to which all he says concerning the perfect sanctity of the Mother of God may be referred is this: Mary is the divine ideal of man. She is man par excellence.[6]

Consequently, she is the Immaculate, who commences a new race of men who are free of the former ferment of corruption. Mary built the edifice of her personal sanctity upon the original sanctity received from God, to which she was able freely to give her consent from the first moment of her existence. She acquired this sanctity with the exercise of her free-

5. M. Jugie, *Homilies Mariales Byzantines,* Greek texts edited and translated into Latin in P.O.,t. XIX, Introduction, p. 458.

6. M. Jugie, La doctrine mariale de Nicolas Cabasilas, in *Echos d'Orient,* XVIII, 1916-1919, p. 375, ff.

dom, fully utilizing her divine gifts, which are the same as those given to humanity, either both before or after the fall. Wherefore, God did not bestow such privileges upon Mary that she enjoyed anything which had been witheld from Adam and his descendants.

The Immaculate was then associated with God in the work of the Redemption. Cabasilas enlarges upon this theme, dealing with it especially in the second discourse, that of the Annunciation. He affirms that since humanity must participate fully in the Redemption, Mary was necessary, she who was "pure man" par excellence. In fact, in Jesus Christ, human nature was united to divine nature. He was a Man-God, absolutely impeccable, because His free will did not tend toward evil. However, according to Cabasilas, it was required that the natures, before being united, should be separate in their respective integrity, and that an integral human nature cooperate in the Redemption. God waited until this aid was offered Him, and in all time, the only person found worthy of being associated in the work of God was Mary.

She cooperated in the Mystery of the Incarnation in two ways: 1.) with the contribution of her immaculateness, which made her worthy of being chosen; 2.) with her most free consent to the Angel's announcement. The participation of the Blessed Virgin in the work of our salvation manifested itself in another way: although she was exempt from every sin, although enriched with the gifts of original justice, she suffered in union with Jesus Christ, and in imitation of Jesus Christ, she died.

The theme is developed in the homily of the "Dormition", which, far from being as we would suppose it, a sermon on the Assumption, is rather a treatise of Mariology.

He rejects totally the fantastic and picturesque particulars of the Apocryphal writings concerning the Assumption. His contemporaries Palamas and Glabas[7] did not always avoid these exaggerations. In this long dissertation the part which refers explicitly to the fact of the Assumption may be reduced to very little. At the same time, it is evident that he is striving to tell the reasons *de convenientia* and of concordance with the divine plan

7. Gregorio Palamas (1296-1359), for instance, in his homily in the Dormitio B.V.M. does not attain the dogmatic profondity of Cabasilas. Mary as a girl in the temple received a special food from the angels which is supposed to have given her immortality like that of Adam (P.G., 151, 462). Nevertheless, she subjected herself to death in imitation of her Son. For the same reason she remained three days in the sepulchre (P.G. 151, 467). He also collected legendary elements such as the coming of the apostles "ex omni gente ad eius funera" (P.G. 151, 463) and there describes "Angelorum ministeria corosque circa eam, et rite honorifice comitantium et insequentium" (ibidem, cf. etiam P.G. 151, 463, 466). Yet his Mariology is not wanting in interest.

Cf. M. Jugie, Palamas in D. T. C. XI² cc. 1735-1776; M. Jugie, Grégoire Palamas et l'Immaculée Conception, Revue Augutinienne, XVIII 1910, pp. 145-161.

Isidore Glabas (? - 1387) also Archbishop of Thessalonica (Cf. Le Petit: *Les éveques de Thessalonique*, in *Echos d'Orient* V, 1901, pp. 94-95) has left a homily on the "Dormitio" which is poor in concepts (inter *Sermones Isidori Thessalonicensis*, in P.G. 139, 122-162). In this he merely amplifies Homily II of St. John Damascene with poor rhetoric, especially in the fantastic datails which he had derived from *Eutimiaca Historia* (cf. especially, P.G. 139, 135 and P.G. 96, 747; P.G. 139, 142 and P.G. 96, 734; P.G. 147 and P.G. 96, 738; P.G. 139, 155 and P.G. 96, 746, etc.) Glabas also is a convinced believer in the mediation of Mary (Cf. P.G. 139, 163; P.G. 139, 138), but with the same clarity he denies the Immaculate Conception (P.G. 139-162).

through which the Assumption becomes a logical corollary of the Mariological dogmas and truths accepted by all.

The central idea of this homily may be expressed thus: Mary is with Jesus at the center of the divine plan, and she is the first among all the works of the Creator because she possesses original sanctity, because she is absolutely sinless, and furthermore because she cooperated in the salvation of the human race.

Let us consider a moment his affirmations and consider them in their connection with the mystery of the Assumption of Mary, since it is a theme of general concern in these days.

Unfortunately, in our days the Orientals do not any longer have a liking for the clear position of a Cabasilas, of a Palamas, or of a Glabas, and of an endless series of others with respect to the Assumption. Sergius Bulgakow, for example, accepts the doctrine, but is opposed to the definition. A. J. Bulgakov does not dare to deny it, but says that it has no foundation. In general one senses that deaf opposition to this possible definition which preceded the definition of the Immaculate Conception. Hence, it is all the more opportune to know the thought of Cabasilas on this matter. We shall extract the affirmations which are found in this homily. It is not an orderly work. Like his other works, it reflects that warmth of ardor and the vivacity which is characteristic of the Byzantine writer.

For Cabasilas, Mary is at the center of creation. Everything that was created was created for Mary, just as the tree is created for the fruit. The best fruit of creation is the Blessed Virgin.

God created all things in homage to her and to the Word, her Son. Even more—God created everything through her. Every grace, every spiritual favor, being itself, Cabasilas says, have come to us through Mary.

In the world a need of justice was felt, but no one was able to obtain it. Mary in the eyes of God represents the cessation of continuity in the mass of sinners descending from Adam: "Beata autem et homo est, quia hinc suam traxit originem, et supernaturalem habuit justitiam,[8] utpote Deo soli coniuncta; unde, quatenus homo homines honestat, Deum vero, ad hominum amorem movet, eum sua pulchritudine attraens."[9]

The universal mediation of Mary is extended to men and angels. Following the Pseudo-Areopogite, Cabasilas admits a purification or intellectual progress of perfection in the angels.[10]

---

8. The blessed Virgin with her own free action developed common grace and attained the highest degrees of sanctity, surpassing that of the angels. Like Adam, she was able to sin, but she remained faithful to grace. She obtained the maximum with the Annunciation. She progressed no further, but was confirmed in grace, and enjoyed the Beatific Vision.

9. P.O., t. XIX 501 (383).

10. Pseudo-Dyonisius speaks of the purification of the angels at various places in his works; however, he treats of an illumination and enrichment of knowledge rather than of true and proper purification. Cf. *De div. Nom.* Cap. 7, P.G. 3, 867, commented by St. Thomas, I,II,q. 112a. I ad III Cap. IV; P.G. 3 703 which along with Cap. VI of De Eccl. Hier. P.G. 3, 331 was commented upon in Part III, q. 27, a. I ad III; De Eccl. Hier. cap. III, P.G. 3, 166, cf. S. Th. I q. 108, a. I; cf. etiam de Eccl. Hier. Cap. X, P.G. 3, 274.

All sanctity, present, past and future is in dependence upon her.[11] A particular aspect of her universal mediation is this: The gift of incorruptibility is granted to men through Mary. She, in fact, gave the Savior who rose from the dead, conquering the corruption of the grave. Moreover, she herself constitutes a new beginning of the history of the world, because, being born Immaculate, wherefore without the *"vetus fermentum"*, she is destined to conquer natural corruption.

If her body did not have all the privileges of the primitive state, if it was subject to suffering and mortal, it was nevertheless exempt from the attacks of concupiscence. Therefore, her body was not an obstacle to adherence to the Sovereign Good, and thus, already on this earth, she enjoyed the Beatific Vision.

The Holy Ghost, Who had descended upon her, had changed the natural laws, and had made of her body a "spiritual" body.

The maternity of Mary is a mysterious work of the Holy Ghost, and confers such dignity upon the body of the Blessed Virgin, and such a spiritualization, that Cabasilas would have it almost a glorification requiring a kind of life which is above all the natural laws. This new life assures her the assumption. The exceptional greatness of the Mother of God, Mediatrix of the gift of incorruptibility for men, would therefore demand the Assumption.

On the other hand, Mary is the Co-Redemptrix and has furnished her blood to the Son of God. Cabasilas is pleased to insist upon this thought which makes evident the greatness of the cooperation of Mary's body in our salvation. "Sanguis Beatae sanguis Dei est".[12]

This consideration has not only a rhetorical value. If the assumed dignity of the blood of Mary was so great, one may not easily admit that her body became prey to the corruption of the grave.

This the Divine Maternity and the Co-Redemption become, according to the Mariology of Cabasilas, principles of the Assumption.

It has already been stated that the participation of the Blessed Virgin in the work of our salvation was manifested in another way. Even though she was exempt from all sin, she suffered as her Son did in union with Him and died in imitation of Him. This perfect unity of the Son of God and His divine Mother, and this unity of suffering demand union in glory, and therefore make necessary the resurrection and the Assumption.

The Blessed Virgin, modelled upon the Son had to follow Him in all his paths. To summarize: Death and resurrection are required by conformity with Christ. The Assumption, postulated by this principle, is also

---

11. P.O., t. XIX, 503 (385): prophetis et iustus et sacerdotibus tanto sanctior facta est, quantum sanctificans sanctificatos in ratione sanctitatis superat. Nullus enim sanctus fuit priusquam Beata esset; sed prima et sola a peccato prorsus immunis, seipsam sanctam exibuit, sanctamque sanctorum et si quid maius dicere liceat; atque aliis sanctitatis januas aperuit. Cf. etiam 504 (386).

12. ibid. 502 (384).

postulated by the greatness of her position in creation, by her mission as Mediatrix and Cooperator in the Redemption.

Even though no explicit mention of Eve is made, the principle of recapitulation is evident in the mind of Cabasilas. Christ is at the center of the life of the universe and of the spiritual life, and Mary stands beside Christ. In her and with her the divine plan destroyed by Eve is restored. What Eve lost through sin, Mary recovers with Christ.

d) Lesser Works.

In the Patrology of Migne the following works were published: one homily against usurers (P.G. 150, 729-749); one panegyric on St. Theodora (P.G. 150, 753-772); one fragment against Gregora (P.G. 148, 61).

Theophilos Joannou in *Mnemeta Hagiologika* (Venice, 1884, pp. 67, 114) published one panegyric on St. Demetrio. One panegyric for Matthew Cantacuzene, followed by a fragment of a discourse in honour of Anne of Savoy were published by Jugie in the Bulletin of the Institute of Russian Archeology of Constantinople (c.XV, 1911, M 113-118). Here the date of the first was established as 1453, and of the second as 1347.

A reading of a very small composition such as "Prayer to Jesus Christ" published by Salaville in *Echos d'Orient* (XXXV, 1936, pp. 43-50) is sufficient to give an idea of this theologian's great force. He thanks Jesus Christ for the good thinks which he has given us: creation, life without suffering in the earthly paradise, and then Himself in the Redemption. He has made us sons of God, members of His Body. Jesus Christ lives in the saints and even after their death, he revivifies their bodies and makes them workers of miracles: "Just as in Thy revivifying death, while Thy divine Soul had abandoned Thy immaculate Body, Thy divinity, nevertheless, did not separate itself from It, and in the same time in which it inhabited the breast of Thy Eternal Father, it was with the Soul in the infernal regions, and with the Body in the sepulchre, so are the body and the soul of Thy saints. They are separated one from the other, but were never separated from Thee. The bodies were deprived of their respective souls, but they possess Thee within themselves. Just as the souls rest in Thy hands, the bodies carry Thee as their guest . . . it seems that they have not lost the spiritual charisms and all the efficacity which Thou didst accord them in life even after the separation of the soul." (p. 45)

A spontaneous desire springs up within the reader to see other works come to light which still remain in manuscript form.[13]

III. Spiritual Doctrine.

It seems to me that the spiritual doctrine of Cabasilas may well be summarized thus: It is a doctrine of the divinization of the Christian

13.For example, the "Oratio in Ascensionem Domini" (Vat. grec. 632, 136 v. - 146 v.). "Oratio in Passionem D.N.J.C." (ibidem, 98-III). "Significatio in visionem Ezechielis" (Ez 1,5 seq. Vat. gr. 632, 143 v. - 153; Ez. 37, I seq.; ibid. 153 - 159).

through the Sacraments, especially through the Holy Eucharist. The center of this mystic doctrine of divinization through the Sacraments is, as Salaville remarks, the doctrine of the Mystical Body.

The Byzantine lay doctor employs his whole art to demonstrate how intimate and profound Christ's union is with the just man. Through the Sacraments we participate in a real manner in the life, death, and resurrection of Christ. The intimacy with Christ is so potent, that the Eucharistic Christ becomes our host and our dwelling.

How to express such an ineffable union?

We are flesh of His Flesh, bone of His bone. We are like a drop lost in an ocean of perfume. For Cabasilas it is not sufficient to say "Christ is the spouse of the soul", and "Christ is the Head of the Mystical Body". He says, "Christ is also the Heart of the Mystical Body". In conformity with the function of a heart and a head, Christ communicates to us movement and life.

We are adoptive sons with a closer affinity than that which sons have with their parents. In fact, in natural generation the actual blood of the infants is no longer that of the parents. On the other hand, through the effect of the Sacrament, the blood by which we live is actually the blood of Christ, and the flesh which is given is the Flesh of Christ. Both the members and the life are possessed in common.

His eucharistic realism prompts him to forget that which is accidental. One would say that for Cabasilas, the eucharistic species no longer exist. Here are two more characteristics of his theology of the Mystical Body in relation with the Eucharist: 1) the necessity of the Eucharist for the "glorious" resurrection; 2) the affirmation of Christ's royalty which becomes most intimately present to the soul. Intimacy and royalty do not exclude one another.

The whole spiritual and mystical life of the Christian is based upon this dogmatical foundation: the members of the Mystical Body should remain pure like vases containing the Blood of Christ; they should progressively transform themselves into Him with their own personal forces, aided by Christ Himself, by His Sacraments and by the graces obtained through the mediation of Mary.

Bossuet called him "un des plus solides thèologiens de l'Eglise grecque". This much is certain, that even though some of his affirmations should be accepted by theologians with reserve, his value in the field of spiritual theology is exceedingly great.

Dr. Lino Mangini

Comments and Documents

THE VIEWS OF PROF. ALIVIZATOS ON THE HOLY OFFICE'S INSTRUCTIONS ON THE "ECUMENICAL MOVEMENT"

A series of three highly significant articles from the dissident Greek point of view on the *Instruction of the Holy Office on the "Ecumenical Movement"* were published in an Athens newspaper in the month of April. We reprint them substantially below as a complement to our account of reactions to the *Instruction* which we published in the preceding issue of *Unitas* (*Unitas,* Vol. II, No. I, 1950). These articles represent a voice from the separated Greek Church, a Church which merits our immediate concern in matters bearing upon reunion since it is a Church which is close to us in belief, and one with which *reunion* in the strict sense of the word is readily conceivable.

The articles appeared under the general title of *The New Trend of the Vatican*. The author, Prof. Hamilcar S. Alivisatos, while not an official spokesman of the separated Greek hierarchy, speaks with considerable authority because of the great respect bestowed upon him in the ecclesiastical circles of the separated Oriental Church. He is a theologian and canonist of note, professor at the University of Athens, was a delegate of the Holy Synod of Greece at the Amsterdam Assembly of the World Council of Churches in 1940, and a member of the Panorthodox Congress of Theology which took place at Athens a few years ago.

These articles are addressed to the dissident Greek public. They do not attempt to explain the various points contained in the document. Rather, the author, seeing that the *Instruction* gives directives for a positive line of action with regard to the "Ecumenical Movement", dwells upon the idea that the Catholic Church has changed her orientation upon the non-Catholic world. More properly, the *Instruction* is merely a declaration of what line of action the Church intends to follow with regard to this new movement which took concrete form only in 1948 at Amsterdam. It does not signify a reversal in her policy, since until the drawing up of the *Instruction* she had not actually formed one.

Nevertheless, Dr. Alivisatos finds grounds in this document of the Holy Office for fresh hope in a future reunion. He seems to point to the Roman Church as a sort of precedent or example to be studied by his own conservative Church, since it is the conclusion of a Church which is likewise conservative, which defends like principles, and which in discussions with Protestant bodies is obliged to confront similar doctrinal hazards.

In the first of the articles, appearing on April 11 under the title *The New Trend of the Vatican,* Prof. Alivisatos hails the *Instruction* as a sign of a new policy on the part of the Vatican with regard to the rest of the Christian world. Whereas the Catholic Church previously merely insisted upon a return of all other Christians to her and prohibited either official

or unofficial participation in dogmatic discussions, as at Amsterdam, the author finds that she has now changed her attitude, but not completely. "The basis remains undeviating: the Church, her truth, her authoritative head remain the same with regard to her unchanged and unchangeable substance and aspirations." There is a change in method and system which is in contrast to that which until now prevailed.

The Church, he affirms, is a living organism, enjoys that elasticity which permits prudent adaptation to facts and the development of life. Her capacity for change of direction according to changes of circumstances is not unknown. The counter-Reformation followed the Reformation; the Vatican State followed the period of the "prisoner of the Vatican". The Church knows how to properly evaluate both theory and force of circumstances.

The change may seem late. However, a conservative body moves slowly and chooses the moment to act when the most benefit will be reaped. "In our day, and especially in the last 30 years and more, the unionistic movement of the Christian Churches under the form of the so-called 'Ecumenical Movement' has expanded to an incredible degree. Indeed only 'individualists' find it impossible to follow it, to estimate its deeper causes and to foster positively the strengthening of those relations and contacts which, granted, will not bring—particularly in our day—unity of the Churches and of the whole Christian world. They will nevertheless prepare the ground for its realization, albeit in the distant future. Unity will indeed be realized because Christ—contrary to the convictions of those men who are short-sighted where the divine is concerned—has so willed it and prophesied it."

On April 12 he continues his observations on the Vatican's "New Trend" with an article on the "Ecumenical movement". Fifty years ago such an idea was a dream. In the last 50 years an atmosphere of mutual respect between Christian Churches has been created which is replacing the ignorance and contempt which formerly prevailed. The author has had experience in the labor involved in accomplishing this attitude for his own Church.

The second period has been initiated. Systematic contacts between churches are being made in international congresses and conferences. True and objective knowledge is being obtained one of another.

There is no better means of furthering this mutual knowledge than that of representatives explaining authoritatively what his own Church is and what it believes. "It is not a question of dogmatic discussions in the stricter sense. Much less is it a question of concessions of any kind which no one is disposed to make, or if offered, to accept. Neither is it a question of agreement for the accomplishment of a facile, superficial and insincere union which would dissolve as quickly as it was made. The question is

merely that of developing the real elements of each and every church's substance. Only when complete knowledge has resulted through a complete mutual understanding—than only the day will come of discussion, critical study and inquiry into possible elements of union, of approach and finally of unity." All this will require a long period of time.

An underlying cause of the "Ecumenical Movement" lies in the menace of Communism which now dominates central Europe and central Asia. The danger is not so much in the programme of social justice which the Communists pursue—which is also inherent in Christianity—as it is in the imposition of a materialistic ideology. Communism, striving to make man a machine, regards Christianity as Enemy No. I.

Christianity remains apathetic. Its divisions, the isolation of the various churches open to Communism a free field for action. The "Ecumenical Movement", the author finds, favors the renewal of a Christian ideology capable of opposing Communism. Some Christians find in this reason to fear for their particular dogmas. The more immediate danger is Communism. No time is left for theological speculation. At this moment, as he sees the situation, only that much theology is needed as would assure a common ideology and faith for re-uniting Christians. He continues:

"In face of the actual state of the universe, what is the position of the largest Christian Church, the Roman Catholic Church, whose history and power are well-known, and above all the end toward which all her forces tend? She understood the immediate spiritual and ideological danger (of Communism) more promptly and more completely. Less conservative in her aims and energies than she was supposed, she opened without restraint or reserve a vehement campaign against the anti-Christian and anti-God Communism. She faced bravely all those consequences and results which we have come to know, of a frontal attack. Her campaign is not directed against social justice, nor, as has been maliciously reported, from a leaning towards capitalism—which she has condemned in principle, as she has condemned the tyranny of the blind trade unions. The justice of the golden mean found in the Gospel was delivered to the working men, and the tyrannical domination of the machine castigated without respect to the hands in which it was found. The ideology of materialism was struck at its most vital point. Hence the furious reaction.

"But the one-sided struggle that the Roman Catholic Church is waging is an unequal one. Her isolation is only too apparent. At the same time, she perceives the new current and spirit of cooperation among the whole Christian world which has developed outside the walls of the Vatican. She sees the unmistakable strength of the front created outside her against a common danger. She realises especially that for the victorious pursuing of the common struggle against an enemy power which has assumed an incredibly vast spread of width and depth, it is imperative that all existing

forces be employed, and without exception. The aim of correcting and fortifying the Christian principles which she represents and defends, is not the monopoly of one sole Christian body. By the concentration of all available forces an unconquerable reinforcement of the front will be assured.

"She is beginning to realize that outside of the Roman Catholic fold there are other and great forces, and she does not fail to see the responsibility which would befall her if she should not employ them, or rather if she should refuse to cooperate with them. She recognizes that she, like the Churches outside her pale cast off the fanaticism and one-sidedness that have prevailed until now, which have no other result than the fostering of further division and separation of forces which are needed, each several one, for the struggle. There are faithful and important children of Roman Catholicism who realize fully the significance and importance of the cooperation which is being developed and constantly increased in international ecclesiastical relations. It does not escape the Roman Catholic Church that they stress the need of changing direction, and that they urge the abatement of absolute demands and the adamant stand of their Church in respect to the rest of Christian world. Nor does 'Mother Church' turn a deaf ear or remain unmoved in face of perilous circumstances, and of the need which has been reported to her of cooperating with those other Christians, who omit no opportunity of stressing their grief at the withdrawal and self-isolation of Roman Catholicism, and who realize well and rightfully its dignity and power.

"The fact of the necessity has matured in the conscience of the Church. She has abandoned her hesitations. Finally, the austere policy of *non possumus* which has prevailed until now could be changed without difficulty to something more gentle and serene to cope with the newly created situation. Long and methodical observation already made through unofficial contacts, and deep study of the new situation have proved that the hour has come for change. Girt about, it is true, with all the phrases and forms of hierarchical traditional, discipline and order, a change of direction has been accomplished to the consolation of those who realize her need, and to the joy of the entire Christian world."

Dr. Alivisatos continues his considerations of *The New Trend of the Vatican* with a third article appearing April 14 under the subtitle *To a Period of Union.* He says:

"The document of the *Instruction,* in spite of limitations, cautions, reservations and suggestions, unquestionably opens a door to new directions and orientations, all of which serve, of course, to further the aims of the Church.

"Certainly the avowed new policy presented in the historical document does not pretend to constitute an automatic achievement of the union of the Churches nor, indeed, is it to be concluded from the document that the

Roman Catholic Church desires this. The document is of recent publication, and we do not yet have the criteria that will come with detailed application of the instructions imparted. Moreover, restrictions are formulated regarding all the points of its content. Neither does it signify the razing of the walls that divide the Roman Catholic Church from Protestantism and Orthodoxy, walls which have very deep foundations, the work of centuries. Yet without doubt a door has been opened in these closed walls, if only a very small one, and this small door, for those interested, is important. It is sufficient to cause a stir in the currents both within and without. The opening of this little door which coincides with the opening of the Holy Door during the present Holy Year, has its value as the beginning of a new turn of events. We know well the Greek adage: 'Well begun is half done.' The fact is that in spite of decrees—decrees of but yesterday—unofficial theological contact with other churches is now permitted, even though under supervision (and does this not exist on the part of other churches as well, even though in a more liberal way?) and instead of that absolute *non possumus,* prayer in common is now permitted, with a sole limitation: the use of that noblest, most beautiful, and in its meaning, the widest prayer, the Lord's Prayer. These things indeniably constitute signs that the new period of ecclesiastical history is now certainly beginning. It will be characterized as the period of union in contrast to the preceding one which was clearly characterized as the period of division. This new character is being impressed upon all ecclesiastical territories without exception or limitation. Arrayed together with a single end in view, they will advance with a good heart and high determination in a single front in the struggle against the enemy of the true Christian ideology and order."

The author continues with the belief that this common victory may be the beginning of a removal of obstacles that divide the Churches, and the prelude to real union among Christians. This much desired unity will come about when each Christian can say "I have arrayed myself with Christ."

In spite of the caution and wise patience ruled in applying the new instructions, and in spite of the distrust which sad experience has engendered, the new trend has brought about a new spirit of joy and hope which should be shared by the peoples of the two great historical Churches, the Roman Catholic and the Orthodox.

He continues: "It is a wise thing that the endeavour to repair the rent garment of Christ should begin from the attempt to fit together those fragments which, though torn, have in no wise perished, and consequently are easily fitted together. Joining them requires only a neat seam. If well done, it will suffice to banish all traces of a tear. When this is done a further work of fitting to together should be taken up with still greater toil and

skill: the sewing together of the parts which present greater rents. Without doubt, the two great Churches of the East and the West are contained in the first category and the first place. After them would follow the Anglican Church. It would be of the greatest significance if, ever within the framework of the 'Ecumenical Movement', special endeavour were made for a closer approach and better mutual understanding of those more closely related Churches. It would further the fulfilment of a parallel attempt on the part of the others.

"Many factors have contributed to separation. There are even more which serve to justify enmity from both sides. But the spirit of the now well-established 'Ecumenical Movement' rejects as unacceptable the opening of old wounds, and the repeating of the former inflammatory catchwords. It insists on manifestations of good will to remove causes of misunderstandings and to check the tendency to division. Furthermore, a door to agreement with the Roman Catholic Church is being opened by the new instructions, and good will towards our Church has been manifested by recent Popes, and especially by the present illustrious Pope Pius XII. In view of these things, I believe that it is not impossible to attain mutual understanding and contact which would make possible the required atmosphere for future reciprocal recognition of the place and the rights of each of the two great Churches. Their main characteristics are, on one side, the well understood Primacy, and on the other, the free and democratic quality of the ecclesiastical bond which in every way is consonant with the Greek interpretation of the Greek text of the Gospel.

"Perhaps all this is still premature and still needs long study and thought before we shall be able to advance to the discussion even of fundamental points, a thing impossible without the creation of a suitable atmosphere which to-day is quite lacking. Assuming the sincerity of the new watch-word, it will be, however, important if on our side too a more consistent endeavour is created in regard to the whole 'Ecumenical Movement'. There should be a pure, unfeigned and unhesitating initiative on the part of the more closely connected ecclesiastical organizations, as has already come to pass elsewhere, especially among the Protestant bodies.

"In any case, I hail with joy the beginning of the change which has taken place, and the manner in which it has taken place. I pray that soon the generation, not indeed our generation—I cannot see that as a possibility —but the coming generation may be deemed worthy to see that 'paradox' of separation ended, one, holy, catholic and apostolic Church fully restored. To-day, we merely direct our endeavours towards this end. We see it, as it were in reflected image as something about to be created, a new period of happy life for the whole of mankind through the reign of the most high law of Christ, of actual, not theoretical charity."

A PROTESTANT VOICE ON CATHOLICISM AND REUNION

A letter signed by Ferdinand Renaud to the *Gazette de Lausanne,* and published on February 2, describes the attitude of a Protestant of good will before the apparently unsurmountable obstacles between Protestants and the Catholic Church. After speaking of the most unfortunate fact of division, and the ardent desire of every sincere Christian to work and pray for union, he expresses the hope that the Catholic Church will show signs of a favourable attitude toward the Protestant world during the Holy Year. He then continues:

"There is widespread hope" the *Times* writes "that Rome will make a gesture to the Christian world in keeping with the realities of the hour."

"One must not nourish too great illusions on this point.

"It is incontestable that due to the rigidity of her doctrine, the Roman Church impedes the reunion of the different Christian confessions. But may one ask of her that she renounce herself? Would not this be to pursue an illusory unification, or a superficial union which could only precipitate trouble and confusion in the souls of the faithful? . . .

"If the Roman Church should enter the way of doctrinal concessions, would it not soon mean her being frittered away, her dissolution? After a short time what would remain of the Christianity which she would have to offer us? Certainly it would be a fluid and amorphous sort of Christianity. Would we not have then the realization of Renan's words 'We live on the perfume of an empty vase? . . .' And an empty vase does not keep its perfume very long.

"It is doubtless extremely moving to read in the article of Georges Rigassi *'Pour l'unitè des Chrètiens', Gazette de Lausanne,* that the accredited representatives of 151 churches had been able, in spite of their diversity, to work for two weeks on the strengthening of the bond which unites them (at Amsterdam, Assembly, Aug. 1948) . . . .

"It is extremely moving, but is it not also very disconcerting? 151 churches! Instead of fostering the hope that bit by bit still many more churches will come to be added to these, is not one obliged, on the contrary to felicitate the Roman Church for maintaining her cohesion, even at the price of an intransigence which costs her dearly?

"I know many Protestants, even ministers, who far from blaming her, rejoice in her doctrinal firmness.

"Does this mean that one should despair? Certainly not. Let the grace of God work. It has its ways which we do not know. And let us unite in prayer, and even now in that which alone can assure a hearing of our prayers with the Master: charity.

"Let us work, 'both on one side and the other', as M. Georges Rigassi desires it, 'to bring hearts closer together, to make our enclosures less im-

permeable, our separations less dense.' And I am in agreement with him in wishing 'that the Christians of all confessions become more conscious of their common bonds, and that they put the emphasis upon that which unites them', but I permit myself an addition: without diminishing anything of that which is the foundation of their faith."

* * * *

BISHOP O'HARA'S PROTEST TO THE RUMANIAN GOVERNMENT.

Bishop O'Hara, recently expelled Regent of the Nunciature in Bucharest (cf. News), delivered a protest to the Rumanian Foreign Ministry. His letter reads as follows:

The Apostolic Nunciature presents its compliments to the Ministry of Foreign Affairs of the People's Republic of Rumania, and, according to instructions received from the Secretariat of State of His Holiness, has the honour to bring the following to the attention of the honourable department:

1) The Holy See has to record with deep and painful regret that the hostile attitude and the struggle conducted by the Government of the People's Republic of Rumania for two years against the Catholic Church in Rumania, against the Holy See and against the Supreme Pontiff himself, and against the latter's representatives with the Government of the People's Republic of Rumania, has now reached the point of bringing into play against them a public political trial.

It is indeed evident that the incrimination of a former employee of the Apostolic Nunciature, charged with alleged acts of espionage and other political crimes, is merely a pretext for involving in the same alleged accusations not only the members of this Nunciature, serving as representatives of the Holy See, but also the Holy See itself, and for discrediting also the entire Catholic Church.

This action is being aggravated by unspeakable comments and slanderous contentions, widely spread through the Press and radio.

2) In the face of such an attitude, which constitutes an outrage on the honour and dignity of the Catholic Church and her representatives, the Holy See has the duty of raising a formal and solemn protest. This protest is all the more eloquent and categorical as the falsity, arbitrariness and distortions are evident in the means by which have been presented, during the trial in question, the alleged proofs, and, in general, all the circumstances and all the facts advanced during that trial and attributed, directly or indirectly, to members of this Apostolic Nunciature.

3) In raising this solemn protest, the Holy See, taught by experience of the past, certainly does not expect the return of truth or public repara-

tion on the part of the Government of the People's Republic of Rumania.

It leaves on the conscience of the leaders in Rumania the full responsibility for their course of action. Regarding the public offence given to the Church and the representatives of the Holy See, she leaves the matter, with confidence and serenity, to the judgment of the Rumanian People.

News

ECUMENISM AND REUNION

Series of Conferences of World Council of Churches.

Delegates to the World Council of Churches assisted at a series of conferences held at Toronto, Canada, between July 3 and August 21. Leaders from Protestant and dissident Oriental communions from more than 60 countries on five continents assisted at the conferences and assemblies which planned action and established policy affecting over 160,000,000 Christians. An estimated 5,000 delegates and visitors attended.

The annual meeting of the Central Committee of the World Council of Churches, a policy-making body consisting of 90 members whose scope is cooperative action among 156 Protestant, Old Catholic and dissident Oriental churches in 44 countries, took place between July 8 to 15.

Nature and Purpose of World Council.

Dr. Visser 't Hooft, General Secretary of the Council, in urging Christians to remain in contact with fellow-Christians behind the Iron Curtain, found opportunity for approaching the question of the nature and purpose of the World Council of Churches. He said that the World Council's doctrinal position has been attacked as both fundamentalist and modernist, that politically it has been criticized as a tool of both capitalism and communism. He urged that all opportunities be employed for correcting false impressions, and for clarifying and explaining its goals.

He warned especially against the term "world Church", and the necessity of correcting the false notion that the World Council could develop into a super-church.

The Central Committee debated the question of the meaning of membership in the World Council of Churches, and adopted a statement bearing the title, *The Church, the Churches, and the World Council of Churches* for discussion in the member churches during the coming year. They will be asked to express their opinions on it to next year's meeting of the Committee. Salient points of the document are as follows:

1.) The World Council is not a "super-Church" and will never become so. It has no authority or desire to impose any views or actions upon the churches which compose it. They remain free, each church acting through its own governing body, to accept or reject the decision of the Council. "The authority of its Council consists only in the weight which it carries with the Churches by its own wisdom."

2.) The World Council is composed of over 150 churches or denominations. All of these churches believe that they ought to be in relations of closer unity than they are at present. But they do not all agree upon what form of final unity they seek. The answer to that question is one of the

matters which the churches meet each other in the Council in order to discuss.

3.) Among the churches in the Council, many different views are held as to the meaning of "the Church". In the traditional creeds, widely used in most churches, is the phrase "I believe in one Holy, Catholic Church." Some churches, like the Eastern Orthodox, who are represented in the Council, or the Roman Catholic, who are not, take this to refer to their own church and that other churches are not in the full sense "in the Church". Other churches believe that "the One, Holy, Catholic Church" is the sum total of the people calling themselves Christian. Various intermediate views are held by groups like Lutherans, Anglicans, etc. But the World Council is open for membership to churches which hold any of these views and the Council itself holds no one view. It is the fellowship within which all such views are discussed.

4.) The churches in the Council are held together by all being agreed upon the central Christian doctrine of the deity of Jesus Christ. The Constitution of the Council states that it is a "fellowship of Churches which accept Our Lord Jesus Christ as God and Saviour." It is the agreement of all the member churches upon this point which enables them to remain in "fellowship" with one another while discussing together their disagreements and seeking to overcome them.

Conference on Faith and Order.

Plans were approved for the third World Conference on Faith and Order to be held at Lund, Sweden, in 1952. The aim will be to discuss the obstacles to unity presented by differences of faith and order, including the non-theological factors that hinder and those that accelerate the unity of Christians. Subjects to be considered will include the nature and purpose of the Church and its Ministry, the task and function of the Church on earth, different ways of worship, and obstacles to intercommunion.

New President Elected.

Bishop Eivind Berggrav of Oslo, Lutheran primate of Norway, was unanimously elected as one of the presidents of the World Council of Churches, succeeding former Archbishop Erling Eidem of Sweden, (Lutheran) who resigned because of advanced age.

History of "Ecumenical Movement" in Preparation.

A two-volume history of the "Ecumenical Movement" is now in preparation by the World Council of Churches. It is expected that it will be published in 1952 in preparation for the Second General Assembly. The first volume will deal with four centuries of "Ecumenical Movements",

from the Reformation to the World Missionary Conference at Edinburgh in 1910. The second volume will deal with the modern movement from 1910 to the Amsterdam Assembly in 1948.

Bishop Bell Speaks on Radio.

Bishop Bell (Anglican) of Chichester, chairman of the Central Committee meeting at Toronto, remarked during a radio address:

"One of the most striking features of the 20th century has been the coming together of the Christian Churches on a world scale. It is known as the 'Ecumenical Movement'. Beginning in missionary enterprise, it continued in a movement among the churches. In 1948 at Amsterdam, the World Council of Churches was founded.

"Here for the first time we have the Orthodox Churches, and other Eastern Churches, and the Protestant, Anglican and Old Catholic Churches of the West, all cooperating to facilitate common action, common study, a united Christian witness, and mutual support in the task of evangelism. The potentialities are very great. The Russian Orthodox Church does not see its way to join the World Council in its present form. But apart from it, and other Orthodox Churches under its immediate influence, already 156 Churches have joined."

As to the Catholic Church, "the new papal pronouncement indeed encourages Roman Catholics to cooperate in certain ways, though it is difficult at this stage to see how far the limited permission goes." (EPS)

Protests Against Joint Ordination and Intercommunion.

The council of the American Church Union has passed a strongly worded resolution "utterly condemning" the action of Bishop Hall of New Hampshire (Episcopalian) and his clergy when ministers of other Christian bodies in New Hampshire joined with the Bishop in laying hands on the head of a "deacon" with the intention of ordaining him to the priesthood, in Grace Church, Manchester, N. H., U.S.A., on St. Mark's day. In the terms of the resolution this act was called "the most flagrant known breach of the Church's doctrine and discipline yet committed in the Episcopal Church throughout its history."

Another resolution of protest, passed by the Maryland branch of the Clerical Union (Episcopalian), relates to the action of the Right Rev. Angus Dun, Bishop of Washington, who on Ash Wednesday conducted a celebration of the Holy Communion in the Cathedral of St. Peter and St. Paul, where ministers of various denominations assisted. A minister of the Lutheran Church of the Reformation read the Epistle, and a Congregationalist minister read the Gospel. All Christian ministers of Washington, except those of the Roman Church had been invited to "Join with us . . . by receiving Holy Communion". (Church Times)

AROUND THE WORLD

ROME

Decree Against Usurpation of Ecclesiastical Offices.

Under date of June 29 the Sacred Congregation of the Council published a decree against those attempting uncanonical siezure of ecclesiastical offices. Excommunication *ipso facto* and reserved *speciali modo* to the Holy See is incurred by:

"1.) Those who plot against the legitimate ecclesiastical authorities or in any way attempt to subvert their powers.

"2.) He who, without the title or canonical appointment, conferred in accordance with the sacred Canon Law, occupies an ecclesiastical office, benefice, or other ecclesiastical dignity, or permits himself to be installed in or to hold them.

"3.) Those who participate, directly or indirectly, in the crimes of which mention is made in numbers 1 and 2, all disposition to the contrary notwithstanding."

Erection of Episcopal Hierarchy in British Territories of Africa.

His Holiness Pope Pius XII, by a decree of the Sacred Congregation of the Propagation of the Faith, under date of April 18, erected an episcopal hierarchy in the territories of missions existing in British West Africa and in the British Mandates of Camerum and Togo. However, three ecclesiastical provinces were established: the first in Eastern Nigeria, comprising the metropolitan archbishopric of Onitsha with three suffragan dioceses of Owerri, Calabar and Buea, the first being situated in Camerum; the second extending to Western Nigeria with the metropolitan archbishopric of Lagos and the two suffragan dioceses of Ondo and Benin City; the third comprising the Gold Coast, with the metropolitan archbishopric Cape Coast, and the four suffragan dioceses of Accra, Kumasi, Tamale and Keta, the last in the Togo. In Sierra Leone was erected the diocese of Freetown and Bo, immediately subject to the Holy See. The territories of the new ecclesiastical Hierarchy number 962,553 Catholics and 360,096 catechumens. (Civ. Cat.)

Mar Severios Makes a Holy Year Visit.

His Excellency Joseph Mar Severios, Administrator Apostolic of Tiruvalla, India, of Syro-Malankar rite, was a Holy Year visitor at Rome during the month of June. His colorful vestments attracted the eyes of many during the tremendous Corpus Chrisit Procession which took place in St. Peter's Square.

A major object of this visit was the resolving of problems of organi-

zation and deciding questions of a disciplinary and liturgical sort for the Malankar Catholic Church with the Sacred Congregation for the Oriental Church. The Malankar Catholic Church, which he represents, has taken on considerable proportions since Mar Ivanios led the movement of reunion with Rome among the Malabar Christians in 1930. Its two dioceses now number about 70,000 faithful. (cf. The Reunion Movement in Malankara, South India, p . . . .)

Romans interested in the Oriental Church and in the cause of reunion had the opportunity of witnessing the Syro-Malankar rite at a Pontifical Mass which Mar Severios celebrated at the Church of St. Bridget at the invitation of the *Unitas Association*. He was guest of honor at a reception following the Mass at which Cardinal Tisserant presided. He also celebrated publicly at the churches of both the Friars and the Sisters of the Atonement at Rome. On this latter occasion, the church of the Sisters was well filled with a congregation of the Italian "popolo". Although the rite was strange to these simple people, they followed the celebration with the closest attention, and found in it not something exotically fascinating, but a source of profound devotion. They responded fervently to Mar Severios' appeal for prayers for the return of the remaining Jacobites.

INVITATION

Visitors at Rome during the Holy Year who are not members of the Catholic Church will receive a special welcome at the UNITAS FOYER which has been opened especially for their convenience. UNITAS will strive to assist them in any way that will make their visit agreeable and profitable. Should they desire accurate information on the Catholic Church, they will be put in contact with competent persons of their language.

UNITAS FOYER
Palazzo Salviati,
Piazza della Rovere, 83,
Rome.

BELGIUM

Death of an Apostle of Reunion.

Dom Constantin Bosschaerts, O.S.B. Oliv., titular Abbot of Sienna, died last spring at Schotenhof, near Anvers. Dom Bosschaerts, born in 1899, was one of the first Belgian monks to interest himself in the apos-

tolate for the return of Oriental Christians. In the years 1926-27 he founded an institution for the oriental apostolate which became the center of the "Vita et Pax" movement, and which was affiliated with the Olivetan Benedictines. The purpose of this society was the formation of monks and nuns for the apostolate of reunion among Orientals. A double oblature was added to the religious: internal and external oblates. The latter should pursue studies of medicine, law, literature, fine arts, etc., with an orientation upon reunion. He founded a new "Vita et Pax" center of Byzantine studies at Louvain in 1948, under Dom Robert van Cauwelaert, the first Superior. (Cath. Unio)

* * * *

FRANCE

Priests Speak in Private Homes.

Four years ago, priests in a parish in southern France conceived a new method of combatting low church attendance. They reflected upon a frequent objection, "Speak to us of Christ; in the pulpit you speak too much of dogma and morals." They began giving a series of sermons in the homes of their parishioners. The talks were centered upon the person of Christ. These talks have had encouraging results. Not only practicing Catholics, but many who would not have entered a church attend them. While a well attended church ceremony will attract about 200 persons, more than 500 have been coming to listen to the home sermons for four years without loss of interest.

* * * *

GERMANY

Dr. Niemoeller Withdraws Hostile Accusations.

Dr. Niemoeller, Protestant Minister and chairman of the Council of Protestant Churches in Germany, has formally withdrawn a charge he made—and which was followed by wide repercussions—that Catholics had secured for themselves an undue influence in the affairs of the West German federal government. The retraction was made in the presence of Federal Chancellor Konrad Adenauer, Protestant Bishop Lilje of Hanover, and other prominent ecclesiastical and political persons.

In the course of the meeting Bishop Lilje stated that the Protestants of Germany welcome close cooperation with their Catholic fellow-citizens and in no way are interested in a denominational division of minds.

At this time, Protestant editors and journalists in a meeting held at Bad Boll expressed a desire of close cooperation with the Catholic press

"in the accomplishment of our common task in a de-Christianized world." (NC)

Christians of Three Confessions in One Church.

Due to the extreme lack of church edifices resulting from the ravages of the war, Christians of three confessions are using the Church of St. Catharine in Luebeck: The Catholics, the Protestants and the separated Greeks. The latter have obtained permission to wall off a part of the crypt to form a chapel for their own cult.

* * * *

UNITED STATES

Friars of the Atonement Hold Conference on Christian Unity.

The Franciscan Friars of the Atonement held their annual conference on Christian Unity at Graymoor, Garrison, N. Y., U.S.A., from June 27 to June 29. 30 delegates from four Friaries took part. Very Rev. Angelus Delahunt, S.A., Father General, opened the conference with a solemn votive Mass of the Holy Spirit. During the three days of conference papers were read on different aspects of the reunion problem. Rev. Edward Hanahoe, S.A., national director of the Chair of Unity Octave, delivered an address on "The Ecumenical Movement of Modern Protestantism" in which he described the 40 year-old movement as a "search for religious unity in a world-wide context".

Various papers were read by these Friars—whose principle scope is Christian Unity—on methods and techniques of promoting the Chair of Unity Octave. Very Rev. Samuel Cummings, S.A., editor of "The Lamp", monthly publication of the Atonement Friars, discussed "The Literary Phase of the Christian Unity Apostolate".

This conference on Christian Unity commemorated the 10th anniversary of the death of Father Paul, founder of the Friars of the Atonement, who was likewise the founder of the Chair of Unity Octave, and co-founder of the Catholic Near East Welfare Association.

It will be remembered that the Franciscan Friars of the Atonement cooperate with the Unitas Association of Rome in the publication of *Unitas*. The English edition is printed by the Atonement Friars at their Graymoor Press, at Peekskill, N. Y.

Byzantine Rite Celebrated at New Orleans.

The Liturgy in Byzantine rite was celebrated in a Catholic church of New Orleans last March by Rev. Lawrence Tardo, director of the Melurgia Byzantine choir of Rome.

The Celebration of the Liturgy was accompanied by Byzantine melo-

dies from the 12th, 14th and 17th centuries which were taken from the library of the Monastery of St. Nilo of Grottaferrata, near Rome. These melodies had not been interpreted and transcribed until a few years ago. They were deciphered by Father Tardo and musicologists of Copenhagen, Bucharest and Oxford.

A Jesuit scholastic explained the ceremonies during the course of the Liturgy. The faithful received Holy Communion under two species. This oriental note was something new in the unique mixture of Spanish and French tradition which flavours the atmosphere of that American city.

Ukrainian Catholic Clergy.

At the present time there are in the Byzantine Catholic Exarchate for Ukrainians in the United States:

102 diocesan priests of the diocese.
27 religious priests: Basilian Fathers, Redemptorist Fathers, Franciscan Fathers.
81 refugee priests who have assignments in the Exarchate.
21 refugee priests who have jurisdiction to celebrate the Holy Mass and hear confessions.
15 refugee priest-monks.

As of March 1, 1950, there was a total of 246 priests in the Ukrainian Catholic Diocese in the United States. At the request of Bishop Constantine Bohachevsky, Apostolic Exarch, more than 100 displaced priests have been brought to the United States from temporary havens in Europe. At the present time over 40 affidavits for more refugee priests have been presented to the proper authorities. (The Way, Philadelphia)

* * * *

ARGENTINA

A New Diocese of Dissident Greeks.

A new diocese for the separated Greeks of South America will be established in the near future with seat at Buenos Aires. Archbishop Michael, head of the dissident Greek Church of North America left New York City for a visit to Buenos Aires to make necessary arrangements.

The separated Greeks of South America number about 40,000. More than 2,000 of them are at Buenos Aires. Most of them are Europeans who emigrated to Argentina after the war. The community now possesses one church and one private school. (EPS)

* * * *

CZECHOSLOVAKIA

"Religion Informers".

The Prague Communist regime has organized a body of agents known as "religion informers" whose duty is trying to attract priests and to lead

lay Catholics to the Communist cause, throwing discredit on the Church and contriving to separate the faithful from the clergy and the clergy from the bishops. They plan to accomplish the work of disintegration in three years.

The "religion informers" first made their appearance when the regime launched the spurious "Catholic Action" in the summer of 1949. This effort did not succeed, and the failure was attributed to a lack of knowledge of Catholicism. Special courses were then organized for these agents.

The "religion informers" intend above all to win the allegiance of lower clergy. They are also charged with setting up the spurious "Catholic Action" in every town.

* * * *

POLAND

"Patriotic Priests"

The Communist politburo of Warsaw had recently ordered the district and provincial Communist organizations to organize local branches of "patriotic priests". Specially trained agents have been dispatched by the central government to aid local units in forming such branches. The main purpose of these branches is said to be the holding of meetings and the passing of resolutions supporting the Communist regime in its measures against the Church and attacking the "intransigence" of the bishops and the "political maneuvers" of the Vatican.

Branches of "patriotic priests" have already been formed in Cracow, Poznam and Szczecin (Stettin). Two approaches are employed in persuading priests: threats of police action and promises of a share in the "Church fund" that the regime acquired by confiscation of most Church lands a short time ago.

It is reported that a number of the "priests" taking part in this movement are not ordained priests, but graduates of spurious seminaries set up by the Communists at the end of the World War II.

In Poland as well as in Czechoslovakia, Rumania and Hungary, an intense campaign has been commenced against Catholic religious. The daily press has informed the Catholic world of the barbarous details which easily convince us of the grim determination behind the organized Communist programme for effacing the Christian faith from the peoples under their domination. It is indeed a sign for the Catholics who are left free to fortify their own faith with the examples of heroic loyalty which abound among the persecuted religious, and to pour forth prayers in brotherly sympathy for their excruciating sufferings. Prayer is our most effective weapon in resisting this formidable attempt to separate our fellow Christians of central Europe from the See of Peter.

Appointment and Rejection of Coadjutor to Bishop of Czestochowa.

In July Fr. Adalbert Turowski, Rector General of the Pallotine Fathers in Rome was appointed Coadjutor *cum iurel successionis* to Msgr. Kubina, Bishop of Czestochowa who has reached his seventieth year. Fr. Turowski had hardly arrived in Poland when he was expelled from the country.

* * * *

SPAIN

Study of Protestant Problem in Spain.

A very thorough study of the status of Protestantism in Spain has been made recently by Richard Pattee, a consultant on international Relations to the National (American) Catholic Welfare Conference. His findings have been published by the National Council of Catholic Men in a 57 page pamphlet. A two-volume study of Spain by this author will be published shortly. Dr. Pattee has studied each reported incident of persecution or injustice carefully, making careful inquiries either on the place of its occurrence, or through reputable authorities.

He says, "What is most important is that these acts were condemned by the proper ecclesiastical authorities; the responsible persons arrested, and in every case, those who engaged in the acts belonged to the Requetes (fanatical Rightists). In no instance were the ordinary members of Spanish Action involved."

He explains that the feeling toward Protestants in Spain is not a product of the Franco government, but springs from past history and tradition. Spaniards feel a peculiar sense of mission in the defence of Catholicism. They have become inflexible, adamant, suspicious of spiritual innovations.

The author points out the extremely small number of Spanish Protestants—about 0.036 per cent of the population—contributes greatly to the lack of separate facilities and protection for them. Even though they are few, he finds that many of them have deliberately manifested violent anti-Catholicism and contempt for things held sacred by the overwhelming body of Spanish Catholics. Thus, much of the anti-Protestant feeling can be accounted for. (NC)

Apostolic Visitor for Ukrainians Visits Spain.

His Excellency Ivan Buchko, Bishop of Lviv, sole remaining Prelate of the Ukrainian Hierarchy, and now Apostolic Visitor for Ukrainians in Western Europe, recently made a visit to Spain, arriving at Madrid, April 28. His purpose was a pastoral visit to the Ukrainian faithful residing in Spain. He was received with great enthusiasm, not only by the Ukrainian

Colony, but by Spanish ecclesiastical and cultural personages as well. In his few busy days, he visited among others, the students of Eastern Europe, guests of the *Obra Catolica de Asistencia Universitaria,* and the *Centro de Estudios Orientales en Madrid,* which is under the direction of Fr. Santiago Morillo, S.J. He celebrated a Pontifical Liturgy at the splendid Church of St. Francis.

The live interest in the Oriental Church which has become widespread in Spain is reflected in the activities reported by *Oriente* (organ of the *Obra Misional del Oriente Cristiano*). The June edition tells of a "Day of the Christian Orient" at Burgos, another of the Feast of St. John Chrysostom at Seville, a Mass in Maronite rite on the Feast of St. Maro at Salamanca, and an Oriental day in the Congregation of St. John Berchmans at Madrid. Fr. Morillo has even celebrated in Byzantine-Slav rite with a choir of twenty-five Ukrainian students in a prison school. The same number of *Oriente* reprints two of a long series of encyclical letters of Spanish Bishops on the observance of the Chair of Unity Octave.

* * * *

SWEDEN

Dr. Yngve Brilioth, New Lutheran Primate of Sweden.

At a session of the Swedish Cabinet, Dr. Yngve Torgny Brilioth, (Lutheran) Bishop of Vaxjo, was named Archbishop of Upsala, and Primate of the Church of Sweden. Archbishop Brilioth has been associated with the "Ecumenical Movement" since the time of Archbishop Soderblom and the Conference of Stockholm in 1925. He is a member of the Central Committee of the World Council of Churches, and President of the Faith and Order Committee.

The new primate of the Swedish State Church is strongly opposed to the modernistic and liberal thought which has gained ground among the Swedish Lutheran clergy. In his opinion, the Swedish Church is at fault through too much toleration of so-called liberal priests whom he sees as actually denying the fundamental truths of Christianity. Each pastor now believes as he chooses, the conception of sin varies from parish to parish, and the Swedish Church is split in countless divisions. He fears that every second Swedish minister would be found guilty of teaching incomplete doctrine and of committing crimes against his oath.

He defends the absolute freedom of the church with regard to the state. The church, he declares, owes allegiance to no higher authority and receives authority from Christ. He feels that the adherence of the Swedish Church to legal obligations and rules which have survived, while the inner unity has perished, are a menace to the faith, and finds that it is now necessary to refer directly to the authority of the Gospel itself for the spiritual guidance of the Swedish population. He regrets that the modern Swed-

ish state should seem to have rejected the Christian tradition, deprived as it is of spiritual resources, and is determined, that in no case shall the state ever "rule in the world of the soul".

Yngve Brilioth is an outstanding Swedish medieval historian, whose abilities are enhanced by a brilliant literary style. He has published works of great consequence on the history of the Swedish Church in the late middle ages. He is also a master in the modern history of the English Church, and has published studies on the Anglo-Catholic Movement and eucharistic doctrine which have become classics in their English translation. His studies on the youthful Newman and his circle are widely quoted in contemporary literature. He has not yet published theories on the formidable criticism which Newman later made of his own arguments. A study of these more mature arguments of Newman might be even more fruitful, and might conceivably be accompanied by a less unsympathetic view of the Catholic Church on the part of Dr. Brilioth.

* * * *

TURKEY

Ecumenical Patriarch Defends Prerogatives of Constantinople.

Patriarch Athenagoras of Constantinople, in an address to all members of the Separated Oriental Church, on the occasion of the "Feast of Orthodoxy" last February, came to the defense of the prerogatives claimed by the dissident "Ecumenical See". His statements were evidently directed against Patriarch Alexis who is attempting to draw the separated autocephalous Churches away from their dependance upon Constantinople, "Second Rome" of the Byzantine Emperors, and into the orbit of the "Third Rome" of Stalin's Moscow.

He says, according to *Orthodoxia,* organ of the Patriarchate of Constantinople, (No. 2, 1950), that his See is so closely bound to pure orthodox Christianity through its long and venerable history of struggles in favor of the true faith which the original ministers of the Gospel transmitted to her, that the Church's history is completed through her by indestructible chains.

He proceeds to say, "It is for this reason that the Church, founded by the Holy Apostle Andrew, the First called, so humble and small in numbers at the beginning, has been glorified and elevated to the dignity of Ecumenical See and of a centre, respected by the whole divinely directed circle of the Church—a centre which unites and maintains all the autocephalous orthodox Churches, independent in administration according to ecclesiastical canonical economy, which exist in the various countries and localities, and which, united at this center, form one indivisible body. Generally speaking, it is only through this Mother Church, that is, through

communion and contact with her, that the different orthodox Churches are united to the body of the holy orthodox Church, one, Catholic and Apostolic, of which the head is not other than the head and perfecter of the faith, our Lord Jesus Christ.

"The Mother Church, whose existence has been an incessant struggle for the preservation of the ancestral faith and virtue, for the stability of the holy Churches of God, and for the salvation of each orthodox community, is fully justified in counting on the obedient piety of her children and upon the exact and spontaneous accomplishment of their duties toward her."

We look forward to the day when the Patriarch of Constantinople will be able to strengthen his plea of succession from Andrew with the more cogent one of union with that Church which "the head and perfecter of the faith" founded upon Andrew's brother, the Prince of the Apostles.

* * * *

RUMANIA

Bishop O'Hara Expelled from Rumania.

In early June, His Excellency Gerald Patrick O'Hara, Regent of the Nunciature in Bucharest, was expelled from Rumania. He is Bishop of Savannah--Atlanta, U.S.A., and has been serving as Regent of the Nunciature in Rumania since May, 1948. Along with him were expelled the Auditor of the Nunciature, Msgr. Del Mestri, and the Secretary, Msgr. John Kirk. Bishop O'Hara was accused of persuading Nicolas Popescu, chauffeur and courier to the Nunciature, to undertake espionage work under the direction of Msgr. Del Mestri.

Pilgrimage of Rumanian Refugees at Rome.

Upon his arrival at Rome, Bishop O'Hara was acclaimed enthusiastically by a large group of Rumanian Holy Year pilgrims who happened to be at Rome at the time. The pilgrims were Rumanian refugees coming from France, Germany, Austria and Italy.

The greater part of these pilgrims was made up of separated Rumanians of Greek rite, whose presence testifies to the growing sympathy between "Orthodox" and Catholic Rumanians. It is acknowledged by many that the separated Rumanians have been deeply impressed by the loyal resistance of the Catholics to the Communist regime in their country, and are becoming convinced that the Catholic Church is sincerely at one with the people. All the newspapers of the Rumanians in exile have pointed out the significance of this pilgrimage. The "Vestitorul", newspaper of the Rumanian refugees in Austria, writes, "This fact holds particular significance for the extraordinary circumstances in which we live. . . . The participants belong to both of the two Rumanian confessions. In this tem-

pest which we are passing through, the Christian unity of the nations is becoming ever more strong, in keeping, indeed with that which is happening in the whole Christian world where contacts and approachements are being multiplied, while the line of a single front against the materialistic and atheistic tendencies is being ever more clearly defined. The blow given to the Uniate Rumanian Church is equally felt by the Orthodox. They know that these measures are directed not only against one particular community, but represent one step in the destruction of the nation and of the Christian faith. Finding themselves in company with the Uniate Rumanians in the City of Saint Peter, the Orthodox condemn the outrage committed against the Uniate Church and against the Catholic Church in general, and bear their sincere homage to the martyrdom suffered by these two Churches. The Rumanian pilgrims, united in mind and sentiment, also go to Rome in the hope of seeing the Holy Father, and to bring to him the homage of gratitude and love. The supreme Head of Catholicism has today become the spiritual guide of the whole world. Even those who do not recognize him on the spiritual plane must agree upon the courageous attitude he has taken before the problems of our times. The decisions of the Vatican correspond with the intimate needs of every Christian. Through the voice of the Holy Father the conscience of the whole world has made itself heard."

In Germany the Rumanian periodical *Patria* (June-July, 1950) writes: "Recognizing the great support which the high spirituality of the Roman Church offers to all Christians in these times of barbarous persecution launched by Asiatic Bolshevism against the national and Christian idea of the peoples behind the Iron Curtain, the Rumanian refugees in exile have found a happy occasion to demonstrate their solidarity with the Roman Church in the common anti-Bolshevik struggle, taking part within the frame-work of the Holy Year in the various solemnities of Rome."

Bishop Aftenie Dies in Prison.

Confirmation has reached Rome of the death of His Excellency Basil Aftenie, Titular Bishop of Ulpiana and Auxiliary of the Archdiocese of Fagaras and Alba Giulia. Details of this death are not known, but he evidently died as a consequence of affliction suffered at the hands of the Communists in the fearful prison of Vacaresti where he had been confined.

Bishop Aftenie was one of the six Catholic Bishops of Byzantine rite arrested at the outbreak of persecution in Rumania in October 1948, at which time the entire Catholic Church of Byzantine rite in Rumania was placed outside the law by the Government Decree of December 1, 1948.

This Prelate who had given proof of absolute loyalty to the Holy See may be considered as a martyr for the faith. No accusation had been made against him. He was imprisoned for the sole reason that he was a Catholic

Bishop, had resisted both the promises and threats of his persecutors, and had refused to renounce communion with the Roman See and pass over to the dissident national church.

Alexander Mircea

* * * *

RUSSIA

Official Report of the Moscow Conference in 1948.

It will be recalled that Patriarch Alexis, on the occasion of the five hundredth anniversary of the Russian Church's achievement of independence invited the heads of the various dissident Oriental Churches to an assembly at Moscow, held in July 1948 (cf. *Unitas,* Vol. I, No. 1, pp. 32-34; Vol. I, No. 2, pp. 74-76—on Anglican orders; Vol. II, No. 2, pp. 107-108). An official report of the Conference has now been published which contains verbatim all speaches made by the delegates on the questions and topics dealt with in a volume of 900 pages. *The Ecumenical Review* (Summer 1950, No. 4, pp. 403-407) prints a review of the texts which have reference to the refusal of the dissident Russian Church to participate in the Amsterdam Assembly of 1948. The report bears the title, *Deyaniya Sovestsaniya Glav i Predstaviteley Avtokefalnych Pravoslavnych Zerkvey v Svyasi s Prasdovaniyem 500-letiya Avtokefalii Russkoi Pravoslavnoi Zerkvi 8.-18. Jula 1948 goda.* (Record of the Meeting of Heads and Representatives of the Autocephalous Orthodox Churches Held in Connection with the Quingentenary Celebrations of the Russian Orthodox Church's Attainment to Autocephalous Status, July 8-18, 1948); Moscow Patriarchate Press, Moscow, 1949.

* * * *

PALESTINE

Statute for Internationalization of Jerusalem.

The United Nation Trusteeship Council has approved the Statute of Jerusalem, which would establish an international government for the Holy City. Nothing as yet has been done to implement the Statute, although it had been directed by the General Assembly to implement it at once. The President of the Trusteeship Council, Roger Garreau of France was charged with the task of acquiring the cooperation of Israel and Jordan who remain bitterly opposed to the move. Another embarrassment to the successful carrying out of the Statute is the failure of Great Britain and the United States to support it. The later favors rather the Israeli position which holds internationalization as impracticable. Moreover, the USSR which first had favored the plan has since reversed its policy.

The Arab League Council meeting at Cairo has approved the Statute in principle, making certain reservations. The approval was made with the newly re-elected Secretary General, Assam Pasha, presiding, who manifests great respect for the Catholic viewpoint in the Palestine question. Last year he had succeded in persuading all State members of the Arab League, except Jordan, to accept the internationalization plan for Jerusalem as suggested in the papal encyclicals.

According to reports from Lake Success, an obstinate campaign is being pursued to overcome the UN decision on Jerusalem. Due to the opposition of two great powers, it is evident that the plan is endangered, and Christians, and in fact all those wishing to safeguard international rights, should continue their active support of this one equitable solution for the city sacred to the memory of our Redeemer.

Msgr. McMahon Awarded Bernadotte Medal.

Msgr. Thomas J. McMahon, President of the Pontifical Mission for Palestine was awarded the Bernadotte Medal by the Red Cross for work among Arab refugees of Palestine. Count de Rouge who conferred the medal, spoke enthusiastically of the tremendous work done in the name of Pope Pius XII by the Catholics of the world in behalf of Arab refugees. Msgr. McMahon is an esteemed collaborator of *Unitas*.

Dedication of New Church Donated by CNEWA.

Msgr. McMahon, who is also director of the Catholic Near East Welfare Association (American) was present in the sanctuary on the occasion of the dedication of the Church of the Immaculate Heart of Mary at Mafraq, Jordania, by Archbishop Gori, Latin Patriarch of Jerusalem. The church, opened two years ago, was built with funds donated by American Catholics through the CNEWA. Two new Churches are nearing completion at Zarka, near Mafraq, and Beitsahour, near Bethlehem. In Bethlehem a new school, donated by the same benefactors, is being built. It is to be used for Syrian Catholics. The relief projects of the CNEWA in the Middle East and Palestine include erection and maintenance of churches, schools, hospitals, refugee centers. (NC)

Permission to Visit Cenacle Conceded to Franciscan Custody.

After protracted negotiations, a last minute decision of the Israeli authorities permitted officials of the Franciscan Custody of the Holy Land to make the traditional Holy Thursday visit to the Cenacle. Various persons who made requests recently to visit the Cenacle had been refused.

The group of pilgrims made up of 24 Franciscans, 50 laymen and a few nuns, were permitted greater freedom in the Cenacle shrine than in former years, but nevertheless, they were as usual forbidden any external acts of devotion.

LEBANON

New Periodical for Priests.

The hierarchy of Lebanon is sponsoring a new monthly review entitled "The Priestly Review". The periodical will carry information of special interest to the clergy, and articles on moral and dogmatic theology, canon law, texts of all Papal documents, and pastorals of the Bishops.

* * * *

EGYPT

Representatives of Seven Rites at Celebration of St. John Damascene.

On the occasion of the twelfth centenary of St. John Damascene's death, a pontifical Liturgy was celebrated at the Greek Catholic Melkite Cathedral at Cairo. Prelates of seven rites assisted, Heads of the dissident Oriental Churches were present, as were members of the diplomatic corps. The music was executed by a Greek Catholic choir of 150 singers.

Second Centenary of Mekhitarist Founder.

A solemn celebration was held at Cairo in May in honour of Abbot Mekhitar Peter of Sivas on the occasion of the second centenary of his death. Archbishop Albert Levame, Apostolic Internuncio to Egypt, presided over the celebration with Msgr. Serapion Oulouhodjian, Abbot General of the Mekhitarists.

The Venerable Mekhitar of Sivas founded the Mekhitarist Congregation of Armenian Catholic rite in the 17th century. The rule of St. Benedict served as basis for their constitutions. The monks, obliged by a war to flee, settled at the island of San Lazzaro among the lagoons of Venice in 1717. A branch was later founded at Vienna. Since then they have accomplished inestimable good for their countrymen, in missionary and educational work, and especially in the printing of an amazing number of books. During the disastrous events of the past two centuries, they have probably done more for the religious and cultural welfare of the Armenians than any other institution. Small houses or colleges depending upon the St. Lazzaro monastery are located at Padua, Rome, Budapest, Aleppo, Alexandria, and Sèvres (outskirts of Paris). Dependant upon the Vienna abbey are others at Constantinople, Plovdiv, Cairo, and Piraeus. The Order numbers over one hundred monks, of whom about eighty are priests.

Anti-Communist Bureau Established.

The Egyptian Minister of the Interior, Fouad Sirag el Din Pasha, has announced that Egypt is creating a special government office to oppose Communism. A staff of highly qualified men will be selected for this purpose. Personnel of the bureau are expected to keep in close contact with all international groups opposing communist ideology.

Book Review

Archdale A. King *The Rites of Eastern Christendom* Rome: Catholic Book Agency, Piazza Ponte Sant' Angelo, 28. Two volumes, 678 and 664 pages.

The field of liturgical worship in the Eastern branches of the Catholic Church is a vast one. It cannot be properly treated without a deep insight into problems of national and regional temperament, as well as competence in the fields of history and languages. In English, particularly, the field has been avoided because of the multiple dangers with which it is beset. The standard works of Fortescue on the separated churches have been up to now unmatched as authoritative guides; unfortunately he died before completing a projected work styled "The Uniate Eastern Churches". Donald Attwater's two volumes, excellent though they are for popularizing interest in the Eastern Catholic Churches, were not intended to give technical information on the development of liturgical practice over the centuries. The present two-volume work, for that matter, "is emphatically not one for the expert liturgical scholar" (author's preface, I, ix) but it does delve deeper into the question of origins of various rites and reasons for variations even within a single rite. The aim of the author, modestly stated in his preface (I, ix), is "to provide a manual for those who wish to know something about the rites of Eastern Christendom". He himself has devoted twenty years to the task of gathering information for his opus. A former Anglican clergyman, he was in contact with many of the dissidents before his conversion, an advantage insofar as his acquaintance with liturgical practice among them is personal and direct rather than the result of the study of manuscripts. He has also assisted at every type of Catholic liturgy, except those celebrated in Malabar. The American public might be disposed to regret the impossibility of his surveying the situation in America also at first hand, especially since so many of these rites are represented there and have already undergone changes, unintended and unauthorized in many cases, but not entirely without warrant. Throughout the two volumes, the author gives abundant testimony of his appreciation of and sympathy with the official position of the Sacred Congregation for the Oriental Church in its desire to ensure the ritual purity of all Oriental usages; yet he resists the temptation to lay strictures upon those to whom "uniatisms" have become traditional. Eastern Christians have been notoriously slow to make changes; when the changes have been imposed by ecclesiastics and councils claiming to have authority, they are reluctant to change back again. Patience, and a realization that in matters of taste and veneration for antiquity similar strictures could properly fall on Western practice in the liturgical field, restrain him.

Those who might be discouraged at the monumental size of the two volumes, and the formidible appearance of liturgical terms not only in

Greek and Slav, but in languages like Geez and Malayam, together with liberal quotes in Latin, should be urged to read the Introduction. It summarizes admirably all the reasons why the Church is at present so solicitous for the welfare of her Eastern children, gives credence to the oft-repeated hope that the day of Unity for others who use these rites but are still separated from Rome might dawn even in these times, and drives home an impression of the true Catholicity of the Church, still regretably misunderstood by too many who cannot see beyond the Latin rite. Those who read the Introduction would need no urging to follow up the author's leads by turning to other sections of his work, some of which are truly fascinating. The rites of Antioch and Alexandria take up the rest of Volume I, and in them we are taken back to the early days of Christianity, with an explanation of the Christological heresies that gave rise to the existence of different ritual groups within the same patriarchal area, with the divisions continuing even after the sharper points of the heresies had been forgotten. The chapter on the Syro-Malankara rite gives testimony to the lengths to which the Church will go in the recognition of rites that exist in an area only because of (comparatively) modern dissensions, her latitude in tolerating disciplinary practices not in conformity with present Western legislation, her willingness to keep in office ruling prelates of bodies returned from schism. The section on the Ethiopian Church does not omit the sadder chapters of the Portuguese occupation, or the recent Italian one, both of which contributed to the hardening of separation from Rome.

The second volume deals with the rites of the Byzantines, Chaldeans, and Armenians. After an explanation of the various national groups concerned in the Byzantine classification, he treats the rite as an integral whole. He tries to surmount the ever-present difficulty of nomenclature by using "Ukrainian" and "Ruthenian" almost interchangeably (II, 47 ff.) but is apparently unaware that the faithful of this group in the Eparchy that has its seat at Pittsburgh in the United States strongly resent the application of "Ukrainian" when directed towards them. He also overlooks the fact that in this Eparchy there are many parishes in which the Liturgy and other services are celebrated in Magyar rather than Slav, which may fore-shadow, though faintly, a further change in conformity with the principle of accommodation of the Byzantine rite to the language of the people who use it.

Of great value to the student of Christian worship are the translations of the Liturgies as used by Eastern Catholics, with indications of whatever textual differences may appear in the dissident books, and variant usages found even within the same rite. Where there have been great changes in the course of time, as is the case in the Liturgy of the Syro-Malabarese, he gives a complete esplanation of how these came into being, and explains the painstaking process of restoration of original readings and actions now

being undertaken by the Oriental Church Congregation under the guidance of His Eminence Cardinal Tisserant. Every section of the book has been presented to specialists in that particular field, whose corrections and suggestions have been integrated into the text.

As the work was printed at the Vatican Polyglot Press, a number of typographical errors find their way into print; on the whole, however, these are in reference to minor matters. In the field of statistics, a difficult business at best, those acquainted with the existence of Oriental rite groups in America would be inclined to dispute the singularly small numbers given in the matter of non-Byzantine groups; these are taken from an official publication put out by the Sacred Congregation for the Oriental Church in 1934.

While the two volumes are intended primarily to present the picture of the worship of Oriental rite Catholics in communion with the Holy See, the author succeeds admirably in his aim "to say nothing whatever offensive concerning those dissident Christians, who have kept the lamp of Christianity burning through many centuries of slavery and persecution." If they still doubt the sincerity of the Church in her avowed purpose of preserving intact the sacred rites of the glorious Churches of the East, they would learn from Dr. King's work that few of the Church's present-day activities are being carried on with such painstaking zeal for accuracy and the preservation of all that is good as the revision of ecclesiastical books now in process at Rome.

Dunstan Donovan, S.A.